

**THE CONCEPT OF KOINONIA IN THE NEW TESTAMENT, ITS BASIS  
BACKGROUND AND DEVELOPMENT**

by

**Frank Gould Carver**

**Thesis**

**Presented for the Degree of**

**Doctor of Philosophy of the University of Edinburgh**

**in the Faculty of Divinity**

**May, 1964**



## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The completion of the following study carries with it a debt of appreciation to many persons. Foremost of these are Professors Robin S. Barbour and Allan Barr of Edinburgh whose kind encouragement and enlightened counsel were indispensable. Likewise to Dr. Lamb and the staff of the New College Library I am indebted for the considerate and helpful manner in which the excellent facilities of the Library were made available to me.

It is fitting here also to mention those members of my own family apart from whose love, patience and co-operation the present task would have been utterly impossible: my wife, Betty and children, Mark and Carol, who consented to reside with me as aliens in a strange but hospitable land; my parents Mr. and Mrs. Frank A. Carver of Crookston, Nebraska, whose interest and support were always assured; and my sister-in-law, Mrs. Opal Ireland of Santa Barbara, California, who for several months sacrificed her leisure time to type this final draft. To all of these I am deeply grateful.



# ABSTRACT OF THESIS

Name of Candidate ..... FRANK GOULD CARVER  
Address ..... 2212 North Holliston, ..... Altadena, California  
Degree ..... Ph. D. ..... Date ..... May 1, 1964  
Title of Thesis ..... THE CONCEPT OF KOINONIA IN THE NEW TESTAMENT, ITS BASIS,  
..... BACKGROUND AND DEVELOPMENT

As established from their non-New Testament usage the basic meaning of koinonia and cognates is "having something in common with someone else." Due to its unique dual-dimensional capability the koinonia language was found to be particularly useful by several New Testament writers as they sought to apply the saving activity of God in Jesus Christ to the practical concerns of the New Testament Church. At their hands the language bore witness to a "sharing-together quality of life" which was constituted by a common relation to Christ, manifested in a corporate ethic and qualified by a sense of the holy. This can be styled the New Testament concept of koinonia, not because of any semi-technical or religious meaning which the words may have acquired, but only as suggested by the totality of their New Testament contexts.

The koinonia "quality of life" has its foundation in the covenant relationship of God with his people Israel. Here are the common participation in God's redemptive action, the resultant covenant solidarity and the holiness ethic which found their eschatological fulfilment in the life and ministry of Jesus. For as a result of the saving action of God released in the events of Christ's death and resurrection there came into being a renewed and refined covenant unity through the presence of the Spirit of the Lord in the first Christian community. It is this "quality of life" to which Luke in Acts, Paul in his letters and John in his first Epistle gave expression with the koinonia language.

The particular presentation of the koinonia concept of the different writers is due not so much to any developing theological content of the words themselves as to the way in which they understood and articulated that salvation reality for which they used the language. Present in all are the basic elements of the New Testament koinonia, its constitution by God's saving action in Christ, its expression in a genuine corporate concern and its demarcation by the holy character of that eschatological action by which it exists. Each of these phases, however, is variously unfolded by each writer. In Acts the emphasis is upon the new quality of communal life which has resulted from the fresh eschatological impetus of the Holy Spirit; in Paul it is a thorough-going identification of the Christian community with Jesus Christ that is determinative of the quality of its corporate life, ethical response and evangelistic task; and in John, as the life in the Son, man's relationship to the Father and to his brother is one indivisible relationship of agapē-love.

The New Testament koinonia is a unity of religion and ethics in a "sharing-together quality of life" that is characterized completely by Jesus Christ in his salvation significance. The primary function of the koinonia language in the New Testament and the abiding value for Christian thought and life of the concept for which it is employed is in the realm of the ethical. For by it man's relation to his God is vitally and practically related to his conduct in the midst of his fellow men. Thus Christian ethics can be legitimately described as a koinonia ethic.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . .	ii
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	vi

### PART ONE: THE LINGUISTIC BASIS

#### Chapter

I. KOINONIA AND COGNATES, THEIR MEANING AND SYNTAX EXCLUSIVE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT . . . . .	1
--	---

#### Summary

II. KOINONIA AND COGNATES, AN ANALYSIS OF THEIR USE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT . . . . .	28
---	----

#### Implications for the New Testament

#### The Koinonia Language in Paul

##### Koinonos

##### Koinoneo

##### Koinonia

#### The Koinonia Language in the Remainder of the New Testament

##### The Synoptic Gospels

##### The Acts of the Apostles

##### Hebrews

##### I and II Peter

##### The Johannine Literature

#### Conclusion

### PART TWO: THE RELIGIOUS BACKGROUND

III. ANTICIPATIONS OF KOINONIA APART FROM THE NEW TESTAMENT REVELATION . . . . .	109
---	-----

#### Pagan Religion and Thought

#### Old Testament Religion and Social Conceptions

#### Contemporary Judaism

Chapter	Page
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The main stream</li> <li>Essene doctrine and practice</li> <li>The language of Philo and Josephus</li> </ul>	
IV. ANTECEDENTS OF KOINONIA IN THE LIFE AND MINISTRY OF JESUS . . . . .	169
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Eschatological Role of Jesus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The hope of the Kingdom and Jesus</li> <li>Jesus and the proclamation of the Kingdom of God</li> <li>The eschatological role of Jesus and the Spirit</li> </ul> </li> <li>The Character of the Eschatological Community <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The call</li> <li>The commission</li> <li>The Covenant</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
PART THREE: THE THEOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT	
V. KOINONIA AS EXPERIENCED IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH . . . . .	215
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Introduction</li> <li>The Eschatological Setting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Holy Spirit and the eschatological role of Jesus</li> <li>The eschatological experience of the Holy Spirit</li> </ul> </li> <li>The Community Consciousness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"All things in common"</li> <li>Other features of the common life</li> </ul> </li> <li>The Numinous Quality</li> <li>Conclusion</li> </ul>	
VI. KOINONIA AS EXHIBITED IN THE LETTERS OF PAUL . . . . .	254
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Introduction</li> <li>The Eschatological Entity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Risen Christ</li> <li>The Spirit of Christ</li> <li>The Crucified Christ</li> <li>The sufferings of Christ</li> <li>The gospel of Christ</li> </ul> </li> <li>The Corporate Concern <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A "sharing-together" in Christ</li> <li>A "sharing-together" in the ministry of Christ</li> </ul> </li> <li>The Ethical Exclusiveness</li> <li>Conclusion</li> </ul>	
VII. KOINONIA AS EXPRESSED IN THE JOHANNINE LITERATURE . . . . .	344
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Introduction</li> <li>The Common Life: The Divine Perspective <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Word of Life</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	



Chapter

Page

Jesus Christ, the Son of God	
Eternal Life	
The Common Life: The Corporate Ethic	
As one relationship	
A love-relationship	
The Common Life: The Exclusive Character	
The christological exclusiveness	
The moral exclusiveness	
Conclusion	

CONCLUSION . . . . .	417
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	424

## INTRODUCTION

In recent years several New Testament words have been invading the working vocabulary of theologians and the language of the church.<sup>1</sup> One of the more recent of these is *κοινωνία*,<sup>2</sup> or "fellowship," as it is rendered most often by the King James (1611) and Revised Standard (1952) Versions of the New Testament.<sup>3</sup> Indicative of this transference is Paul L. Lehmann's characterization of Christian ethics as "a koinonia ethic."<sup>4</sup> The sense in which he employs the terms is evident as he writes that "the church, the fellowship which is the body of Christ, the koinonia, is the fellowship-creating reality of Christ's presence in the world."<sup>5</sup> The increasing popularity of the term in contexts not

---

<sup>1</sup>Examples include parousia, kērygma and agapē.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Acts 2:42; Rom. 15:26; I Cor. 1:9; 10:16 (twice); II Cor. 6:14, 8:4, 9:13, 13:14; Phil. 1:5, 2:1, 3:10; Philem. 6; I Jn. 1:3 (twice), 6, 7.

<sup>3</sup>The King James Version (KJ) translates "fellowship" ten and the Revised Standard Version (RSV) nine out of nineteen occurrences. The KJ's most usual alternate is "communion" while the RSV goes to "participation" or "share" in recognition of the recent trend of scholarly opinion. In the following pages all Biblical quotations will be taken from the RSV unless otherwise indicated.

<sup>4</sup>Paul L. Lehmann, Ethics in a Christian Context (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1963), p. 14. Cf. his earlier "Foundations and Patterns of Christian Behavior" in Christian Faith and Social Action, ed. John A. Hutchison (New York, 1953), pp. 102ff, and E. Clinton Gardner, Biblical Faith and Social Ethics (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1960), pp. 188ff.

<sup>5</sup>Lehmann, Ethics in a Christian Context, p. 49. Cf. John Baille, The Sense of the Presence of God (London: Oxford University Press, 1962), pp. 138-153, for another instance of the

strictly Biblical suggests that attention to the Biblical context of *κοινωνία* is always in order. The task of the present study is to investigate linguistically and theologically the use of *κοινωνία* and cognates<sup>1</sup> in the New Testament. The purpose is to discover if there is any particular range of ideas which can be uniquely linked with the words, to examine their precise relation to such a concept, and to present in relation to the language the Biblical scope of any "koinonia concept"<sup>2</sup> as developed in the New Testament.

The basic questions in regard to *κοινωνία* and cognates in Biblical context as revealed in the course of modern New Testament studies are those of the ruling idea inherent in the words and the conceptual content resulting from their particular New Testament usage. The problem can be traced with respect to *κοινωνία* for it is primarily upon it that the questions focus. Thayer, whose New Testament lexicon was standard in the English speaking world at the turn of the century, offered the lexical possibilities among others of "fellowship, association, community, communion, joint participation."<sup>3</sup> J. Armitage Robinson writing in 1898 insisted that "fellowship is the ruling idea

---

use of koinonia in the context of philosophical and theological discussion.

<sup>1</sup> *κοινωνός, κοινωνεύω, κοινωνικός.*

<sup>2</sup> In this task cognizance will be taken of the criticism leveled against a too simple identification of Biblical words and concepts by James Barr, The Semantics of Biblical Language (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961).

<sup>3</sup> Joseph Henry Thayer, A Greek English Lexicon of the New Testament (4th ed.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1901), p. 352. Cf. Hermann Cremer, Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek (4th English ed., trans. from 2nd German ed.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1880, 1886).



of the word" as he traced it through its various New Testament occurrences.<sup>1</sup> In a similar manner Arthur Carr in 1913 felt that "*κοινωνία* implies a closeness of union approaching to identity"<sup>2</sup> and like Robinson finds the idea of spiritual fellowship dominating its New Testament usage. Both writers appear to grasp the general significance of *κοινωνία* in its several contexts though their treatments are somewhat inadequate due in part to a lack of attention to the first force of the terms.

C. Anderson Scott writing in the period 1919-1927<sup>3</sup> was really the first scholar to attempt to make much of the use of *κοινωνία* in the New Testament. He took the primary meaning of the word to be that of "partnership" with the resultant sense of "fellowship" rather than "partaking of" in the New Testament.<sup>4</sup> Taking his clue from Acts 2:42 he felt "that in the Acts and the Epistles the word not infrequently bears an absolute significance which corresponds to a specific element in the primary consciousness of the nascent Church."<sup>5</sup> This Scott calls "the Fellowship" defined as "a new name for a new thing,

<sup>1</sup>J. Armitage Robinson, "Communion," Dictionary of the Bible, ed. James Hastings (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1898), I, 461.

<sup>2</sup>Arthur Carr, "The Fellowship (*κοινωνία*) of Acts 2:42 and Cognate words," The Expositor, 8th Series, V (1913), 462.

<sup>3</sup>C. Anderson Scott, "The Communion of the Body," The Expositor, 8th Series, XVIII (1919), pp. 121-130; "What Happened at Pentecost," The Spirit, ed. B. H. Streeter (London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1919), pp. 117-157; The Fellowship of the Spirit (London: James Clarke and Co., Limited, 1921); "The 'Fellowship' or *κοινωνία*," The Expository Times, XXXV (1923-24), 567; Christianity According to Saint Paul (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1927), pp. 159-161.

<sup>4</sup>C. A. Scott, "The Communion of the Body," p. 121.

<sup>5</sup>C. A. Scott, "What Happened at Pentecost," p. 137.



community of spirit issuing in community of life."<sup>1</sup> Little fault can be found with Scott in his general delineation of that with which he connects *κοινωνία* but the manner in which he relates the term to his concept and identifies it with the latter in an almost if not altogether technical sense throughout the New Testament leaves much to be desired.<sup>2</sup>

With the definitive researches of J. Y. Campbell (1932)<sup>3</sup> and Heinrich Seesemann (1933)<sup>4</sup> who make extensive use of non-biblical material a new plateau is reached in the understanding of the usage of *κοινωνία* and cognates in the New Testament. These studies have established the thought of "sharing in" or "partaking of" as primary in *κοινωνία* as well as in its cognates. The article of Hauck in Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament (1938)<sup>5</sup> confirmed in the main the work of Campbell and Seesemann and has furnished much of the basic material for almost all recent discussions.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid. Cf. Scott's The Fellowship of the Spirit and Christianity According to Saint Paul, pp. 159-161.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. the criticisms of William Spicer Wood, "Fellowship," The Expositor, 8th Series, XXI (1921), 31-40, who wrote in answer to the position taken by Scott in "What Happened at Pentecost." He demonstrates that "fellowship" is preferred to "Fellowship."

<sup>3</sup>J. Y. Campbell, "*κοινωνία* and Its Cognates in the New Testament," Journal of Biblical Literature, LI (1932), 352-380.

<sup>4</sup>Heinrich Seesemann, Der Begriff KOINΩNIA im Neuen Testament, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 14 (Gießen: Verlag von Alfred Töpelmann, 1933).

<sup>5</sup>D. Friedrich Hauck, "*κοινός, κοινωνός, κοινωνέω, κοινωνία, συκοινωνός, συκοινωνέω, κοινωνικός, κοινωνόω*," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. Gerhard Kittel (Stuttgart: Verlag von W. Kohlhammer), III, 789-810.

Agreement, however, has not been unanimous among them nor among those who have written since as to the resultant force and meaning of *κοινωνία* and cognates in their varying New Testament contexts. A solid foundation has been laid for their exegesis but problems of precise interpretation yet remain.<sup>1</sup> And although it has been somewhat redefined the spectre of a technical or semi-technical use of *κοινωνία* has not been completely laid to rest. Seesemann concludes his excellent study with the statement "das *κοινωνία* für Paulus ein religiöser Terminus ist."<sup>2</sup> Jourdan goes even further declaring that in Paul the original meaning of *κοινωνία*

had become invested with a spiritual content of such a unique enlargement and application as enabled it to reflect the transcendence of St. Paul's concepts and beliefs concerning the relationship of Christ to his faithful ones and their relationship to him.<sup>3</sup>

Thus the problem becomes basically that of the exact relationship of the language to those ideas and concepts to which it gives expression. Thornton's study of the theological foundations of the Church as they appear in the New Testament<sup>4</sup> which he roots in the New Testament usage and significance of *κοινωνία* underlines the importance of examining the nature of that relationship.

---

<sup>1</sup>For example cf. L. S. Thornton, The Common Life in the Body of Christ (3rd ed. London: Dacre Press, 1950); George Jourdan, "KOINΩNIA in I Corinthians 10:16," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXVII (June 1948), 111-124; A. Raymond George, Communion with God in the New Testament (London: The Epworth Press, 1953), pp. 169-195, 211-215; and all recent commentaries on the various New Testament passages.

<sup>2</sup>Seesemann, p. 99. Cf. George, pp. 185-188.

<sup>3</sup>Jourdan, p. 124.

<sup>4</sup>Thornton, p. 2. This work first appeared in 1942.

Thornton's The Common Life in the Body of Christ comes the nearest to a comprehensive treatment of that which is represented by *κοινωνία* in the New Testament. His handling, however, is subservient to his larger purpose of examining the Biblical materials for a doctrine of the Church, and leads to the discussion of many New Testament ideas which are not directly related to the employment of *κοινωνία* and cognates. Likewise, the extended, but not so comprehensive treatment of the language by A. R. George is only directly in relation to his main theme of communion with God. The present study seeks with due attention and in proper relation to the use of the *κοινωνία* words in the New Testament to explicate that concept or range of ideas which they represent.

Part I of the following study will be devoted to a linguistic examination of *κοινωνία* and cognates first outside and then inside the New Testament to lay a proper foundation for the further delineation of any "koinonia concept" in the New Testament. In Part II the religious background, including briefly Pagan thought, the Old Testament and Judaism as well as the Synoptic witness to the life and ministry of Jesus, of the focal idea involved in the New Testament *κοινωνία* language will be traced. The concluding phase of the study, Part III, will deal with the concept linked with *κοινωνία* as it is developed by those New Testament writers who make significant use of the language; Luke in Acts, Paul and the Johannine literature.



## PART ONE: THE LINGUISTIC BASIS

## CHAPTER I

# KOINONIA AND COGNATES, THEIR MEANING AND SYNTAX EXCLUSIVE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

Κοινωνός

*Koinwros* the adjective form of the noun *Koinwv*,<sup>1</sup> is used almost entirely as a noun<sup>2</sup> and has largely displaced the latter.<sup>3</sup> It is derived from *koinos*,<sup>4</sup> "common" in opposition to *idios*<sup>5</sup> which has

1. J. W. Campbell, "KOINWRIA and Its Cognates in the New Testament," Journal of Biblical Literature, LI (1932), p. 353. This article presents the results and its application to the New Testament of a study of KOINWROS, KOINWREW and KOINWRIA in nearly six hundred occurrences from more than twenty writers ranging in date and character from Pindar (V BC) to Dio Cassius (II-III AD).

2 Its limited use as an adjective is shown in that the only apparently known instance of such usage is in Euripides (V BC) Iphigenia Taurica 1173: μητέρα κατεργάσατο κοινῶς εἶπεί. Unless otherwise documented, all non-biblical Greek quotations are taken from The Loeb Classical Library, ed. T. E. Page, E. Capps and W. H. D. Rouse (London: William Heinemann LTD, 1912-).

<sup>3</sup>Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon (8th ed.; Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1897), p. 823.  
Edwin Mayser, Grammatik der Griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit (Zweite umgearbeitete Auflage; Berlin and Leipzig: Walter De Gruyter & Co., 1936), I, III, 88.

<sup>1</sup>Hauck, "κοινός, κοινῶς, κοινῶρην, κοινῶρίαν, συκοινῶς, συκοινῶρην, κοινῶριχός, κοινῶν" Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. Gerhard (Stuttgart: Verlag von W. Kohlhammer, 1938), III, p. 798.

<sup>5</sup>Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*

developed from σύν.<sup>1</sup> In accord with this and as remarkably stated by Aristotle *Politica* 1328a 25: ἐν γάρ τι καὶ κοινὸν εἶναι δεῖ καὶ ταῦτὸ τοῖς κοινωροῖς, ἅν τε ἴσον ἅν τε ἄριστον μεταλαμβάνουσιν, the fundamental meaning of κοινωρός is "one who has something in common with someone else."<sup>2</sup> The thing which is in common may be a person or persons, and things may have other things or qualities in common. The point to be stressed is that while some kind or degree of relationship is necessarily established when two or more persons have the same thing in common, "the primary idea . . . is not that of association with another person or other persons, but that of participation in something in which others also participate."<sup>3</sup>

A complete construction with κοινωρός requires the explicit statement of both the thing which is shared and the person with whom it is shared. The partitive genitive<sup>4</sup> is normally used for the former and

---

(A New Edition by Henry Stuart Jones and Roderick McKenzie; Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1925-1940), p. 970. Hereafter this edition only will be cited as Liddell-Scott. Cf. Plato *Respublica* I 346 A: Οὐκοῦν καὶ ὠφέλειαν ἐκάστη τοῦτωρ ἰδίαν τινὰ ἡμῖν παρέχεται, ἀλλ' οὐ κοινήν. For the derived sense of "profane" in contrast to ἅγιος for κοινός, cf. Hauck, op. cit., pp. 789 ff. He finds this meaning only in Jewish and Christian contexts. Liddell-Scott, p. 969, cites only NT occurrences for this meaning. This sense of κοινός does not directly affect the words under examination in this discussion.

<sup>1</sup>Philipp Buttmann, *Lexilogus*, trans. J. R. Fishlake (London: John Murray, 1846), p. 375.

<sup>2</sup>Campbell, p. 353.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

<sup>4</sup>Raphael Kühner, *Ausführliche Grammatik der Griechischen Sprache* (Dritte Auflage von Bernhard Gerth; Hannover and Leipzig: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1898), II, I, 343 (Hereafter Kühner-Gerth) lists κοινωρός among the adjectives which use

the comitative dative<sup>1</sup> for the latter. Their occurrence together, however, is very infrequent.<sup>2</sup> The stock example is Plato Respublica II 370 D: τέκτορες δὲ καὶ χαλκῆς καὶ τοιοῦτοί τινες πολλοὶ δημιουργοί, κοινωνοὶ ἡμῖν τοῦ πολιχνίου γινόμενοι, συχνὸν αὐτὸ ποιοῦσιν.<sup>3</sup> Usually the thing shared is mentioned and the normal construction is the partitive genitive alone:

Plato Respublica V 450 A: κοινωνὸν τῆς ψήφου ταύτης τίθετε.

LXX Additions to Esther 16:13, καὶ τὴν ἄμεμπτον τῆς βασιλείας κοινωνὸν Ἑσθῆρ.<sup>4</sup>

Philo De Vita Mosis 155: κοινωνὸν γὰρ ἀξιῶσας ἀναφανῆναι τῆς ἑαυτοῦ λήξεως.

The Amherst Papyri 100, 4: Ἑρμῆς . . . προσελάβετο τὸν Κορνήλιον κοινωνὸν τῆς αὐτῆς λήξεως.<sup>5</sup>

the partitive genitive to express "die Begriffe des Teilnehmens und Anteilgebens."

<sup>1</sup>Kühner-Gerth, II, I, 430. "Als Vertreter des Instrumentalis bezeichnet der Dativ zunächst in komitativem Sinne die Person oder Sache, mit der zusammen eine Handlung vor sich geht."

<sup>2</sup>Heinrich Seesemann, Der Begriff κοινωνία im Neuen Testament, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 14 (Giessen: Verlag von Alfred Töpelmann, 1933), p. 20. Hauch, p. 798.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Plato Epistulae 7, 350 C and 7, 325 A.

<sup>4</sup>The only other instance of this in the LXX is Ecclesiasticus 6:10, καὶ ἔστιν φίλος κοινωνὸς τραπεζῶν.

<sup>5</sup>The Amherst Papyri, ed. B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt (Oxford: University Press Warehouse, 1901). Cf. Josephus Vita 142, Plutarch's Moralia 45 E and Dio Cassius 39, 57, 1.



In line with the phenomenon that a prepositional phrase often substitutes for a case construction because the latter has a tendency to lose its original force,<sup>1</sup> the role of the genitive with *κοινωνός* is sometimes played by a preposition as in Plato *Leges* VII 810 C:

πρὸς δὲ δὴ κοινωνοὺς ὑμᾶς ὄντας περὶ νόμων .<sup>2</sup>

The dative can be used to refer to the thing shared, but this use is very rare.<sup>3</sup> One such instance is Euripides *Electra* 637 (V BC):

ὅθεν γ' ἰδὼν σε δακτυλὶ κοινωνὸν καλεῖ.

Even in the numerous occurrences<sup>4</sup> where there is neither a case construction dependent on *κοινωνός* nor a prepositional phrase, that which is shared is almost always implied or indicated in the context.

A typical case is BGU II 530, 14: ὁ κοινωνὸς ἡμῶν οὖ

συνηργάσατο.<sup>5</sup> Occasionally the character of the partnership is defined by another noun as in Xenophon *Cyropaedia* IV, 2, 21: ἦδη γὰρ

<sup>1</sup>Ludwig Radermacher, *Neutestamentliche Grammatik, das Griechisch des neuen Testaments im Zusammenhang mit der Volkssprache, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament* (Zweite erweiterte Auflage; Tübingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1925), p. 137. "Vielmehr handelt es sich der Hauptsache nach einmal darum, dass Präpositionen an Stelle der alten Casus eindringen, weil diese an ursprünglicher Kraft mehr und mehr verlieren."

<sup>2</sup>For ἐπὶ cf. Plato *Leges*, XII 969 C; for εἰς cf. Plato *Respublica* I 333 B; and for ἐν cf. *Didache* 4:8 and *Barnabas* 19:8.

<sup>3</sup>Seesemann, p. 20.

<sup>4</sup>As Sophocles *Ajax* 284: ἄπαρ μαθήσει τοῦργον ὡς κοινωνὸς ὢν . See below pp. 6f.

<sup>5</sup>*Ägyptische Urkunden aus den Königl. Museen zu Berlin* (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1898), II, 174.



καὶ πρὸς ὑμᾶς ὡς πρὸς συμμάχους καὶ κοινωνοὺς  
διαλέγομαι.<sup>1</sup>

That *κοινωνός* in its primary reference means "partner" or "a participator" is shown by the apparent absence, outside of Jewish and Christian literature,<sup>2</sup> of the genitive of the person in view of the normalcy of the genitive of the thing; and by the relative infrequency of the dative to refer to the person or persons with whom something is shared.<sup>3</sup> This infrequency, partially explained in the same manner as the absence of the partitive genitive as made unnecessary by the context, is most often accounted for by the reason that the thought of others with whom something is shared is either entirely lacking or in the background of the writer's mind.<sup>4</sup> In Plato *Leges* VI 755 C: πάντες οἱ τοῦ πολέμου κοινωνοὶ γενομενός τε ἐν ταῖς ἡλικίαις καὶ γιγνόμενος ἐκάσποτε, the only significance is attached to "participation in war." Thus it is often practically identical with *μέτοχος* as the very existence of *συγκοινωνός* would suggest.<sup>5</sup>

When it is noted that the lexicons and even Seesemann give

---

<sup>1</sup>Plato *Phaedrus* 239 C: ἐπιτρόπος τε καὶ κοινωνός.  
Plato *Respublica* II 369 C: κοινωνοὺς τε καὶ βοηθοὺς  
Epictetus III I, 21: κοινωνός μου ὡν καὶ συγγεῆς

<sup>2</sup>Seesemann, p. 19. See below p. 8.

<sup>3</sup>Campbell, p. 354 states that he has "been able to collect less than a score of instances of the use of such a dative out of a total of one hundred and thirty-five occurrences of *κοινωνός*."

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.

<sup>5</sup>BGU IV 1123, 4: ὁμολογοῦμεν εἶναι τοὺς τρεῖς μετ[ό]χους καὶ κοινωνοὺς καὶ κυρίους ἑκάστων κατὰ τὸ τρίτον μέρος.

"companion"<sup>1</sup> or "Genosse"<sup>2</sup> as a rendering of *κοινωνός*, the question of the limits of its fundamental meaning is brought into focus. Can the idea of intimate association be attached to *κοινωνός* as a basic, though secondary, part of its overall signification; and one which can occasionally become dominant? Hauck would allow the idea of association an integral, yet not primary, role in the use of *κοινωνός* for he concludes: "In *κοινωνός* liegt bes das Moment der Gemeinschaft, das Wort ist deshalb fähig, vor allem auch innige Verbundenheit auszudrücken."<sup>3</sup> Campbell claims that he found no evidence in the writers examined by him which would support "the general meaning of 'companion' "<sup>4</sup> to be ever acquired by *κοινωνός*. An examination of *κοινωνός* used absolutely will furnish the criteria for an evaluation of the validity of these statements.

When used without dependent case or prepositional construction *κοινωνός* seems generally to mean "partner" with something implied as its basis:

<sup>1</sup>Liddell-Scott, p. 970; William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, A Greek English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), p. 440.

<sup>2</sup>Hauck, p. 798. Seesemann, p. 19; Walter Bauer, Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur (Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töplemann, 1952), p. 795.

<sup>3</sup>Hauck, p. 798. The statement which precedes is of value: "Dem Wortstamm (*κοινός*) nach ist das Teilhaben bei *κοινωνός* anders orientiert als zB bei *φίλος* (Verbundenheit in Verwandtschaft bzw Liebe), *εταίρος* (Gefährte an einem gemeinschaftlichen Unternehmen), *συνεργός* (Mitarbeiter an einem Werk) oder dem blassen *μετοχός* (Teilhaber)."

<sup>4</sup>Campbell, p. 354.

Demosthenes XVIII 21: ὁ σός, Αἰσχίνῃ, κοινῶς οὐχ ὁ ἐμός.

Plato Timaeus 20 D: ταῦτα χρὴ φράσῃ, εἰ καὶ τῷ τρίτῳ κοινῶς Τιμαίῳ ξυρδοκεῖ.

Aristotle Ethica Nicomachea V 5, 12: ἀλλ' ὅταν ἔχωσι τὰ αὐτῶν, οὕτως ἴσος, καὶ κοινῶς, ὅτι αὕτη ἡ ἰσότης δύναται ἐπ' αὐτῶν γενέσθαι.

The papyri give instances of κοινῶς used in a technical sense for "business partner" as in The Amherst Papyri 92, 18 (AD 162-163): οὐχ ἔγω φέ κιστίνωνόν οὐδὲ μίσθιον γεν[ό]μενον τῆς ὠρῆς ὑποτελῆ. Other examples of this use include The Oxyrhynchus Papyri XIV 1626, 2 (AD 325),<sup>1</sup> The Amherst Papyri II 100, 4 (AD 198-211),<sup>2</sup> BGU IV 1123, 4<sup>3</sup> and Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum 522, 3.<sup>4</sup> Not in all, however, is κοινῶς used absolutely.

Epictetus (I-II AD) comes the nearest to using κοινῶς in the general sense of "companion." The idea of participation appears to fade more into the background; but at the same time the association implied is not necessarily intimate and remains quite general, referring to the people and even things with whom one has to do. This is clearly shown in I 22, 10: ἐφ' ἡμῶν μὲν προαίρεσις καὶ πάντα τὰ προαιρετικὰ ἔργα, οὐκ ἐφ' ἡμῶν δὲ τὸ σῶμα, τὰ μέρη

<sup>1</sup>The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, ed. B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt (Oxford: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1898-1927), I-XVII.

<sup>2</sup>Cited on page 3 above.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. BGU II 530, 14 (I AD), above p. 4.

<sup>4</sup>Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum, ed. E. W. Dittenberger (Leipzig: Apud S. Hirzelium, 1915-1924), I-IV.



τοῦ σώματος, κτήσεις γυνεῖς, ἀδελφοὶ, τέκνα, πατρίς,  
ἀπλῶς οἱ κοινῶς.<sup>1</sup>

That κοινῶς is capable of expressing an "inner union" as Hauck maintains is revealed in its full construction<sup>2</sup> and is amply illustrated by Philo, who although speaking allegorically, uses it of the marriage relationship. This is illustrated in De Fuga et Inventione 52: ἐρθέρδε δ' ἀσκητῆς Ἰακώβ ματαί γάμον ἑαυτοῦ· πόθεν γὰρ ἄλλοθεν ἢ ἐκ τοῦ σοφίας οἴκου κοινῶν εὐρήσει γνώμην ἀρεπὶ ληπτον, ἥ πάντα συνδιατρίψει τὸν αἰῶνα.<sup>3</sup> It should be observed that this "innige Verbundenheit" is neither the exclusive nor dominant meaning here. The reference to Philo raises the issue of the influence of the LXX<sup>4</sup> on the content of κοινῶς in its use in Jewish and Christian circles.

Campbell admits no departure from the classical usage in the LXX,<sup>5</sup> denying the possibility of κοινῶς acquiring the general sense of "companion." Jourdan<sup>6</sup> identifies its LXX usage with the Hebrew

<sup>1</sup>Cf. I 1, 9; I 12, 16; I 22, 13; II 14, 8.

<sup>2</sup>See above p. 2.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. De Posteritate Caini 83.

<sup>4</sup>κοινῶς occurs in Proverbs 28:24; Isaiah 1:23; Malachi 2:14; II Kings 17:11 (Not in the Hebrew); Additions to Esther 16:13; Ecclesiasticus 6:10, 41:19, 42:3.

<sup>5</sup>Campbell, p. 359. The only two examples of the normal genitive of the thing shared are Additions to Esther 16:13 (cited above p. 3) and Ecclesiasticus 6:10, καὶ ἔστιν ὁ ἅλος κοινῶς τραπέζων.

<sup>6</sup>George V. Jourdan, "κοινωνία in I Corinthians 10:16," JBL, LXVII (1948), p. 111.

which usually lies behind it<sup>1</sup> thus making *κοινωνός* descriptive of a bond of union. Two factors seem to indicate that *κοινωνός* is used with a slightly different emphasis by the LXX translators.

First is the otherwise rare appearance of the genitive of the person<sup>2</sup> made possible by the predominance of the idea of "unity" in  $\text{לִּי וְלְךָ}$ :<sup>3</sup>

Isaiah 1:23, οἱ ἄρχοντες σου ἀπειθοῦσιν, κοινωνοὶ κλεπτῶν ( $\text{לְךָ וְלִי} \quad \text{לְךָ וְלִי}$ ).

Proverbs 28:24, οὗτος κοινωνός ἐστιν ἀνδρὸς ἀσεβοῦς ( $\text{לְךָ וְלִי} \quad \text{לְךָ וְלִי}$ ).

Malachi 2:14, καὶ αὐτὴ κοινωνός σου καὶ γυνὴ διαθήκης σου ( $\text{לְךָ וְלִי} \quad \text{לְךָ וְלִי}$ ).

<sup>1</sup>Every instance of *κοινωνός* in the LXX where a Hebrew text is extant is a translation of the  $\text{לְךָ וְלִי}$  words. This excludes only II Kings 17:11 and Additions to Esther 16:13. It must be kept in mind, as pointed out on the following page, that *κοινωνός* was not the only Greek equivalent of  $\text{לְךָ וְלִי}$  in the minds of the LXX translators.

<sup>2</sup>See above pp. 4f. Campbell considers the first two instances cited below to be adequately explained as "a literal rendering of the common Semitic idiom by which the poverty of the Semitic languages was made good," and the third as "a simple possessive genitive" which does occur occasionally with *κοινωνός* used absolutely, pp. 358f. and p. 355.

<sup>3</sup>Seesemann, p. 20.  $\text{לְךָ וְלִי}$  "united, associate, companion," is from  $\text{לִּי וְלְךָ}$  "unite, be joined." Francis Brown, S. R. Driver and Charles Briggs, A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1901-1955), pp. 287f. Hauck, p. 801 says of  $\text{לְךָ וְלִי}$  in the LXX: "Vor allem ist  $\text{לְךָ וְלִי}$  der Genosse, Gefährte, teils im Sinn der Verbundenheit in gemeinsamen Leben oder gemeinsamen Unternehmen . . . , teils mehr von rechtlicher, gesellschaftlicher oder beruflicher Verbundenheit. . . . Besonders wird  $\text{לְךָ וְלִי}$  von der unedlen, aber engen Verbundenheit von Spiessgesellen zu ihrem gemeinsamen schlimmen Werk gebraucht, Js 1, 23 (*κοινωνοὶ κλεπτῶν*), Prv 28, 24 (*κοινωνός ἀνδρὸς ἀσεβοῦς*)."

Second, the synonymous use of *κοινωνός*,<sup>1</sup> ἑταῖρος (Song of Solomon 1:7 and 8:13) and μετόχος (Ecclesiastes 4:10; Psalm 118:63 and 44:8) to render  $\gamma\gamma\pi$  makes it very probable that "companion" was nearer than "participator" to the translator's mind in his employment of *κοινωνός*.<sup>2</sup>

Philo's use of *κοινωνός* may reflect that of the LXX, for it is reasonable to conclude that the  $\gamma\gamma\pi$  words did influence the connotation of *κοινωνός* when used by Greek-speaking Jews. The only demonstrable tendency to elevate the secondary, though vital, signification of "inner unity" for *κοινωνός* to the exclusion of its primary meaning of "participation" is found in this area. Aside from the LXX and its influence the usage of *κοινωνός* fits the pattern prescribed by its fundamental definition.

### κοινωνέω

*κοινωνέω* is derived directly from *κοινωνός*<sup>3</sup> and means

<sup>1</sup>The Hebrew behind Ecclesiasticus 6:10 is  $\gamma\pi\lambda\omega \gamma\gamma\pi$   $\gamma\pi\lambda\omega$   $\psi$ . The remaining instances of *κοινωνός* in the LXX with a Hebrew original not yet cited are Ecclesiasticus 41:19, ἀπὸ κοινωνοῦ καὶ φίλου περὶ ἀδικίας (לעבד לעבד  $\gamma\gamma\pi$   $\gamma\gamma\pi$   $\gamma\gamma\pi$ ). (The letters bearing the dash have been restored from vestiges still visible) and 42:3, περὶ λόγου κοινωνοῦ καὶ ὁδοποῦ (לעבד לעבד  $\gamma\gamma\pi$   $\gamma\gamma\pi$   $\gamma\gamma\pi$   $\gamma\gamma\pi$   $\gamma\gamma\pi$ ). The Hebrew Text of the Book of Ecclesiasticus, ed. Israel Levi (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1904), p. 6 and pp. 52f.

<sup>2</sup>Seesemann, p. 20.

<sup>3</sup>Raphael, Kühner, Ausführliche Grammatik der Griechischen Sprache (Dritte Auflage von Friedrich Blass; Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1892), I, II, 260. (Hereafter Kühner-Blass) The verbs "auf  $\epsilon\omega$  . . . werden von Substantiven und Adjectiven aller Deklinationen gebildet, die meisten von denen der II Dekl.".



primarily "to be a *κοινῶς* ,"--"to have something in common with someone else."<sup>1</sup> This follows from the general significance of the verbs, which according to Kühner-Blass, "bezeichnen grossenteils ein sich Befinden in einem Zustande oder die gewohnte Ausübung einer Tätigkeit."<sup>2</sup>

The basic pattern of *κοινῶς* in construction and use is essentially that of *κοινῶς* . The full construction requires the partitive genitive and the comitative dative<sup>3</sup> as in Polybius I 6,7: *αὐθις ἐπολέμουν καὶ κατεστρέφοντο τοὺς κοινῶν ἡσάρτας ἡύρρη τῶν πραγμάτων* .<sup>4</sup> The presence of both cases with *κοινῶς* occurs more than with *κοινῶς* but is still relatively infrequent.<sup>5</sup> The most common construction is likewise that with the partitive genitive alone; for example Plutarch's Lives IV 4: *καὶ γὰρ ἀρχῆς ἐκοινῶν ἡσάρ οἱ βασιλεῖς* .<sup>6</sup> The predominance of this

<sup>1</sup>Campbell, p. 355.

<sup>2</sup>Kühner-Blass, p. 260. It is important to note, however, that he adds the qualifying words: "nehmen aber vielfach auch eine transitive Bedeutung an, als: *γαμέω . . . φιλέω* ." See below p. 17 .

<sup>3</sup>Kühner-Gerth, p. 430 lists *κοινῶς* among the group of "Verben der Gemeinschaft" which use the comitative dative to express "die Person oder Sache, mit der zusammen eine Handlung vor sich geht."

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Polybius III 2, 3; Xenophon *Hellenica* VI 3, 1; Plato *Leges* III 686 A; Philo *De Decalogo* 87; BGU III 969, 13; Dio Cassius 37, 41 (*συκοινῶς* ); Lucianus *Philopseudes* 34.

<sup>5</sup>Campbell, p. 355, found it in about one instance in every five.

<sup>6</sup>Cf. *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum* 283, 10; Isocrates *Areopagiticus* 7, 31; Josephus *Contra Apionem* II 174; Philo *De Virtutibus* 152; Plato *Leges* IX 859 E; Xenophon *Respublica Lacedaemoniorum* I 9; Five of the thirteen LXX occurrences can be included here: Job 34:8 (*וְיָגֵן יְהוָה*); Proverbs 1:11 (See be-



construction over against that with the comitative dative<sup>1</sup> highlights again the first force of *κοινωνέω* as "to participate or share" in something. The idea of association often falls into the background making *κοινωνέω* synonymous to *μετέχειν* with which it is frequently used.<sup>2</sup> A rare derivative use of *κοινωνέω* should be noted and accounted for at this point for it has very significant implications for New Testament usage. *κοινωνέω* can be used to designate a participation which is not yet effected.<sup>3</sup> First it can signify "to take a part" in something, that is, "one claims a part in it for oneself."<sup>4</sup> This is met in imperative sentences as LXX Proverbs 1:11, (10) *ὕψέ, μή σε πληρήσωσιν ἄνδρες ἀσεβεῖς, μηδὲ βουληθῇς* (11) *ἐὰν παρακαλέσωσί σε λέγοντες Ἐλθέ μεθ' ἡμῶν, κοινωνήσαν αἵματος* (loose translation of *פִּתְּחִי פִּתְּחִי*).<sup>5</sup>

The second application of this derived use in Hauck's words is "mit jemand Anteil haben (Genosse sein) an etwas, was er vorher nicht

low p. 12); II Maccabees 5:20, 14:25; III Maccabees 2:31. Cf. Robert Helbing, Die Kasussyntax der Verba bei den Septuaginta, Ein Beitrag zur Hebräismenfrage und zur Syntax der (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1928), p. 136 for a treatment of this construction and *κοινωνέω* in the LXX.

<sup>1</sup>Campbell, p. 355, observes the ratio to be more than two to one.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Demosthenes Exordia 25; Isocrates 108 E; Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum 167, 40; Philo De Posteritate Caini 160; The Oxyrhynchus Papyri XII 1408, 25.

<sup>3</sup>Seesemann, p. 4. "einer noch nicht vollzogenen Teilnahme."

<sup>4</sup>Arndt and Gingrich, p. 439.

<sup>5</sup>Cf. Philostratus Vita Apollonii 5, 25 (III A. D.): *καὶ βούρ' ἔφη, "ἀναγθρακίῳ τήμερον καὶ κοινωνέει τοῦ καπνοῦ ἡμῶν."*

hatte,"<sup>1</sup> or to give a share. This sense for *κοινωνεῖν* is very rarely found<sup>2</sup> until after the time of the New Testament. Some fairly certain examples include:

Xenophon Memorabilia II 6, 22: καὶ δούρταται πειρώτες καὶ διψῶντες ἀλύπως σίτου καὶ ποτοῦ κοινωνεῖν.

Aristophanes Wasps 692ff: καὶ κοινωνῶν τῶν ἀρχόντων ἑτέρῳ τινὶ τῶν μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ | ἦν τίς τι διδῶ τῶν φευγόντων, βυρθέετε τὸ πρᾶγμα δὲ ὅντε λεσπουδάκατον.<sup>3</sup>

Plato Republica II 369 E: τί δ' ἡ οὖν; ἕνα ἕκαστον τούτῳ δεῖ τὸ αὐτοῦ ἔργον ἅπασιν κοινὸν κατατιθέναι, οἷον τὸν γεωργὸν ἕνα ὄντα παρασκευάζειν σιτία τέτταρσιν καὶ τετραπλάσιον χρόνον τε καὶ πόρον ἀναλίσκειν ἐπὶ σίτου παρασκευῇ καὶ ἄλλοις κοινωνεῖν.<sup>4</sup>

Philo De Specialibus Legibus II 107: ἀρ' οὐκ ἄξιον ἐρασθῆναι τῶν νόμων, οἵ τοι αὐτῆς γέμουσιν ἡμερότητος; δι' ἣν οἱ μὲν πλούσιοι διδάσκονται μεταδιδόναι καὶ κοινωνεῖν ὅντες ἔχουσι.

Seesemann both accounts for and clarifies this meaning by pointing out that the *εἶναι* verbs connote according to the rule "ein sich Be-

<sup>1</sup>Hauck, p. 798.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid. Seesemann, p. 4. Campbell, p. 367 states that "Classical scholars have been reluctant to admit that *κοινωνεῖν* can ever properly have this sense; when it indubitably does have it, as it does in late writers, they are inclined to regard this as a solecism."

<sup>3</sup>Campbell, p. 368 for a discussion of this passage.

<sup>4</sup>cf. III 403B.

finden in einem Zustand oder die gewohnte Ausübung einer Thätigkeit,"<sup>1</sup> and that in all examples "κοινωρέω nie zur Bezeichnung einer einmal geschehenen oder zukünftigen Handlung verwandt wird; niemals wird damit das einmalige Anteilgeben angedeutet."<sup>2</sup> κοινωρέω means then "to give a share" only in so far as it corresponds to "the habitual practice of an activity;" or is used only to designate basically "a communicating (giving-a-share) attitude." This Seesemann states is further established by "die Bedeutungen von κοινωρικός = 'mitteilsam' und κοινωρία = 'die Mitteilsamkeit'."<sup>3</sup> The rare occurrence of κοινωρέω in this sense is explained by the availability of μεταδιδόσθαι to express a giving of a share which may happen but once or several times, as well as a communicating attitude.<sup>4</sup> The latter, however, can never contain the idea "to make a partner of" through the giving of a share as can κοινωρέω.<sup>5</sup>

The idea of association expressed by the comitative dative with a person or thing<sup>6</sup> plays a larger role in κοινωρέω than in

<sup>1</sup>Kühner-Blass, I, II, 260.

<sup>2</sup>Seesemann, p. 5.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid. His concluding comment is: "Sonst müsste κοινωρία doch auch das einmalige Anteilgeben bezeichnen können." For κοινωρικός cf. Liddell-Scott, p. 970 and Polybius XVIII 48, 7; and for κοινωρία cf. *Hermetica* I 13, 9 (ed. Walter Scott, Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1924, I, 244). Also see below p. 25; cf. *Corpus Hermeticum* 13, 9 (ed. A. D. Nock and A. J. Festugière [Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres", 1945], II, 204).

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Philo *De Specialibus Legibus* II 107, cited above on p. 13.

<sup>5</sup>Seesemann, p. 6. Hauck, p. 798.

<sup>6</sup>κοινωρέω c. dat. heisst 'mit einem oder einer Sache Gemeinschaft haben.' Kühner-Gerth, II, I, 344. Also cf. p.



κοινωρός.<sup>1</sup> The dative of the person is found as early as Euripides Heraclidae (300 BC): ὅς δ' ἐν νικηθεῖς νόθῳ κακῶς ἐκοινώ-  
 νησεν, οὐκ ἐπαίνεσθαι,<sup>2</sup> but is far outnumbered by the dative of  
 the thing meaning "to have to do with."<sup>3</sup> In the LXX this use of κοινω-  
 ρέω with the dative or its equivalent<sup>4</sup> is the prominent one,<sup>5</sup> re-  
 flecting perhaps the fact that  $\gamma \sqcup \pi$ , "unite, be joined,"<sup>6</sup> usually is  
 the Hebrew behind κοινωρέω.<sup>7</sup> Κοινωρέω appears to differ slight-  
 ly from κοινωρός in its relation to the  $\gamma \sqcup \pi$  words, for it is seen  
 to have had all along a use which can readily be utilized in the render-  
 of  $\gamma \sqcup \pi$ , even though not too frequent a one.

There is some evidence for the possibility of the dative express-

430, cited above p. 3, fn. 1.

<sup>1</sup>Κοινωρός expresses this idea in a very general way by its  
 absolute use. See above pp. 6-10.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Plato Respublica I 343 D.

<sup>3</sup>Campbell, p. 356. Cf. Plato Leges VII 801 E; Aristophanes  
Birds 653 and Desmosthenes De Falsa Legatione 334: στρατηγὸς  
 δ' ἐν τῇ ἐδίκησεν ὑμᾶς οὐχὶ κοινωρεῖ τὰς  
 πόλεις ἐθ' ὅτις. Numerous examples could be cited here.

<sup>4</sup>See next page.

<sup>5</sup>Cf. Helbing, op. cit., p. 252. The occurrences of the simple  
 dative are: Ecclesiasticus 13:1, 2, 17 ( $\gamma \sqcup \pi \pi \pi$ ,  $\gamma \sqcup \pi \pi \pi$ ,  
 $\gamma \sqcup \pi \pi \pi$  [Levi, pp. 19f.]); Wisdom 6:23 (σοφία is personi-  
 fied here, so this construction cannot be construed as a dative  
 of the thing shared as Seesemann, p. 8, does); 3 Maccabees 4:16;  
 IV Maccabees 7:6; Theodotion Isaiah 44:11 ( $\gamma \sqcup \pi \pi$ ).  $\pi \pi \pi$   
 with the accusative substitutes three times for the dative:  
 II Chronicles 20:35 ( $\pi \pi \pi \dots \gamma \sqcup \pi \pi \pi$ ); Ecclesiastes 9:4  
 ( $\gamma \sqcup \pi \pi \pi$ ); Ecclesiasticus 13:2 ( $\gamma \sqcup \pi \pi \pi$  [Levi,  
 p. 19]).

<sup>6</sup>Brown, Driver and Briggs, p. 287.

<sup>7</sup>Where there is a Hebrew text available the only exceptions are  
 Proverbs 1:11 (See above p. 12) and Symmachus Psalm 1:1  
 ( $\gamma \sqcup \pi$ ).

ing the thing shared. Two examples which are certain to the extent to which their texts can be trusted are Demosthenes Exordia 25: ἐπεὶ δ' ἀνάγκη τὸν περὶ τῶν μελλόντων πραγμάτων γνώμην ἀποθαιρόμενον κοινωρεῖν τοῖς ἀπ' αὐτῶν γενομένοις καὶ μετέχειν τῆς ἀπὸ τούτων αἰτίας <sup>1</sup> and Philo De Sacrificiis Abelis et Caini 73: τοιαῦτα οἷς κατὰ τὴν πρώτην γένεσιν εὐθὺς ἐκοινωρήσαμεν τροφή, αὐτοῖς ἡσιν, ὄρασις . . . .<sup>2</sup> This of course is contrary to the normal function of the dative with κοινωρεῖν for the genitive usually expresses the idea of participation. A dative of sharing, however, could possibly have developed out of the dative of common cause.

As with κοινωρός prepositional phrases often take the place of the simple dative or genitive with κοινωρεῖν. Its meaning in these instances is to be judged by determining whether the preposition substitutes for a genitive or for a dative.<sup>3</sup>

Very seldom<sup>4</sup> is the accusative used transitively with κοινω-

<sup>1</sup>W. Rennie, Demosthenes, Orationes, Tomus III, Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis (Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1931) excises the phrase κοινωρεῖν . . . γενομένοις with the note "secl. Blass, recte puto. et redundat aliquid et verbum κοινωρεῖν non rite usurpatur."

<sup>2</sup>Campbell, p. 365, remarks that "it would be a slight change from οἷς to ὧν." Other possible but not certain instances of the dative of the thing include Plato Timotheos 65 E (But cf. Campbell, p. 364f.), LXX IV Maccabees 7:6 and Plutarch's Lives Aratus VIII 3.

<sup>3</sup>Examples of different prepositions are: μετὰ, LXX Job 34:8 (Πῶς ἡ γὰρ γῆ) and Demosthenes Exordia 26, 3; πρὸς, Aristotle Meteorologica 354 A2 and Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum 646, 54 (See above p. 15, n. 5 for LXX occurrences); ἐν, Plato Republica V 453 A; ἐν, Plato Philebus 46 B and Symmachus Psalm 1:1; περὶ, Polybius XXXI 18:6; κατὰ, Aristotle Analytica Posteriora 77a, 26.

<sup>4</sup>Kühner-Gerth, p. 344.

Timaeus

νέω<sup>1</sup> as in Euripides Electra 1048: Θίλω γὰρ ἄρ' / τίς ἄρ  
πατρὸς σου Φόρυ ἐκοινωνήσέ μοι . The accusative can be used to  
 intensify the otherwise intransitive verb concept,<sup>2</sup> for example Plato  
Leges 881 D: ἔαρ δέ τις τῷ τοιοῦτῳ ὅσοι ἐλεύθερος συμθάγη  
ἢ συμπίη ἢ τινα τοιαύτην ἄλλην κοινωρίαν κοινω-  
νήσῃ . Seesemann calls this an "Akkusative des Inhalts."<sup>3</sup>

Finally κοινωρέω is used absolutely in accord with its basic  
 significance described above, that is, "to have something in common with  
 someone else;"<sup>4</sup> and in all the derivations therefrom as "to have a share,"  
 "to give a share" and "to associate with."<sup>5</sup> It can also be found in a  
 refined sense meaning merely "to agree."<sup>6</sup> One can safely conclude that  
 the secondary significance of association or "Gemeinschaft" often at-  
 tains the prominent position in κοινωρέω, but it remains only sec-  
 ondary in the overall picture.

## κοινωρία

κοινωρία is the abstract noun answering to κοινωρός and

<sup>1</sup>See above p. 11, fn. 2.

<sup>2</sup>Kühner-Gerth, p. 303.

<sup>3</sup>Seesemann, p. 9.

<sup>4</sup>See above p. 11.

<sup>5</sup>Cf. Revenue Laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus, ed. B. P. Grenfell  
 (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1896), 15:2, 22:2; Lucian  
Alexander 46. Plato Gorgias 507 E, Crito 49 D, Aristotle  
Politica 1253 A.

<sup>6</sup>Philo De Specialibus Legibus may be an example as well as Plato  
Crito 49 D: σκόπει ἤ οὐ καὶ σὺ εὖ μάλ᾽, πότερον  
κοινωρεῖς καὶ συρδοκεῖ σός which H. N. Fowler,  
Loeb (1952), p. 173, translates "Do you therefore consider very  
 carefully whether you agree and share in this opinion?"



κοινῳρέω<sup>1</sup> and in accordance with them has as its root meaning "(the) having something in common with someone."<sup>2</sup> In one of the few occurrences of the full construction with the genitive and the dative, Euripides Iphigenia Taurica 254: καὶ τίς θαλάσσης βουκόλοις κοινῳρία<sup>3</sup> this can be clearly seen. It is often obvious too where κοινῳρία is used alone.<sup>4</sup> As with κοινῳρέω either phase of meaning, participation or association, can assume the predominant role even to the exclusion of the other. Κοινῳρία, however, is more flexible than its cognates in the assuming of meanings which transgress the limits of its basic definition. This is due to its character as an abstract noun.<sup>5</sup> These developed meanings are many and

<sup>1</sup>Kühner-Blass, I, II, 275. Nouns with "ία (ιοη. ιη) meistens Abstracta, abgeleitet gemeiniglich von Substantiven oder Adjectiven auf os, und einigen der III Dekl., als: ἀγγελία, Botschaft, v. ἄγγελος, σοφία, Weisheit, v. σοφός . . . solche Ableitungen sind aber auch von Verben vorhanden . . . Abstracta auf ἴα v. VB. auf εὔ: πολιορκία -- πολιορκεῖν, δυσωπία -- δυσωπέομαι u. viele andere, bei denen oft auch ein Adj. auf os vorhanden ist."

<sup>2</sup>Campbell, p. 356.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Plato Republica 464 B, 461 E. Occasionally a preposition substitutes for the dative in this full construction. Philo De Migratione Abrahami 178: ἡ τῶν μερῶν ἡρὸς ἀλλήλα κοινῳρία καὶ συνῆθεϊς.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Philo De Congressu Quaerendae Eruditionis Gratia 58: οὐδὲν γὰρ τῶν παύλων οὐκ οἶκος, οὐ πόλις, οὐκ ἄλλο τῶν εἰς κοινῳρίαν οὐδὲν διασώζεται. Also Aristotle Ethica Nicomachea V 5, 12.

<sup>5</sup>Seesemann, p. 13 gives the following quotation from Walter Porzig, "Die Leistung der Abstrakta in der Sprache," Blätter für deutsche Philosophie 4 (1930), pp. 66-77 in explanation of this phenomenon: "Die eigentliche Heimat der in einer Sprache festgewordenen Abstraktbildungen ist also in den Fach- und Sondersprachen zu suchen. Gewiss besteht auch in der Gemeinsprache häufig das Bedürfnis, einen Satzinhalt substantivisch zu fassen. Aber wenn dafür ein Abstraktum neu gebildet wird,



varied, depending on their special contexts. Some of these will be cited in the course of the ensuing discussion.

The primary force of *κοινωνία* as with its cognates is shown by the relatively frequent use of the genitive of the thing shared as over against other dependent case constructions.<sup>1</sup> When this type of genitive occurs alone its meaning can be that of a simple participation as in Quinta Hosea 7:4, ἅπαντες εἰς τὸ μοιχεύειν ἐκφυρούμενοι, ὡς ὀπατίου ὁμοίου τοῦ πέσοντος· ἐπαύσατο πρὸς ὀλίγον ἢ πόλις (της) τοῦ φυράματος κοινωνίας, καὶ μετὰ μικρὸν πάντα ἐξυμώθη.<sup>2</sup> But usually a common sharing or partaking is in view as implied in Plato *Respublica* V 462 B: οὐκοῦν ἡ μὲν ἡδοιῆς τε καὶ λύπης κοινωνία ξυρδεῖ<sup>3</sup> and LXX Wisdom of Solomon 8:18, καὶ εὐκλεία ἐκ κοινωνίας λόγων αὐτῆς.<sup>4</sup>

so wird es meist eine Augenblicksschöpfung bleiben, weil sich dasselbe Bedürfnis angesichts desselben Inhalts nicht, wie im geschlossenen Kreise, immer wieder einstellt. Aber die Abstrakta bleiben nicht auf den Kreis, dem sie ihre Entstehung verdanken, beschränkt, sondern haben, wie alle Wörter, eine starke Neigung, sich in der Gemeinsprache auszubreiten. Damit verlieren sie aber ihren Halt an der syntaktischen Wechselbeziehung mit dem zugehörigen Satzinhalt und also auch ihren Charakter als Abstrakta. Sie sind, wo sie vorkommen, in besonderem Masse den Umdeutungen ausgesetzt, die Wörter ganz allgemein bei Neugliederung eines Satzsinnese erfahren." p. 74.

<sup>1</sup>Campbell, p. 357 states that "more than five out of every six genitives used with *κοινωνία* are of this kind, and they are found in about three out of every five instances when it has any qualification at all."

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Plato *Sophista* 250 B: πρὸς τὴν τῆς οὐσίας κοινωνίαν.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Aristophanes *Thesmophoriazousae* 140: τίς δαὶ κατόπτρου καὶ ὀπίσθους κοινωνία;

<sup>4</sup>In the papyri the function of the genitive is often performed

One of the specialized uses of *κοινωνία* mentioned above is expressed by the genitive with *κοινωνία*. Such similar phrases as *πρὸς βίου κοινωνίαν*,<sup>1</sup> *πρὸς γάμου κοινωνίαν*<sup>2</sup> and *πρὸς γάμου καὶ βίου κοινωνίαν*<sup>3</sup> are used in marriage contracts to express the partnership of life in the union of marriage.<sup>4</sup> The roots of this formal use of *κοινωνία* lie perhaps in its employment in the context of sexual union, for example Philo De Abrahamo 100: *γάμος δέ, ὃν μὲν ἀρμόζεται ἡδονή, σωμάτων κοινωνίαν ἔλαχεν, ὃν δὲ σοφία, λογισμῶν καθάρσεως ἐπιμελείων καὶ τελείων ἀρετῶν* and Euripides Bacchae 1276: *Πενθέης ἐμῇ τε καὶ πατρὸς κοινωνίᾳ*.<sup>5</sup> This development and use adequately demonstrates the ability of *κοινωνία* to express intimate association.

by *πρὸς* in the phrase *κατὰ κοινωνίαν πρὸς*, for example Greek Papyri in the British Museum, ed. H. I. Bell (London, 1917), V, 1693, 6: *κατὰ κοινωνίαν πρὸς τοὺς κληρονομῶντας (sic ous) τοῦ νεκροῦ Σοῦρου τοῦ χαρίσιου* Cf. The Oxyrhynchus Papyri 1642, 30.

<sup>1</sup>BGU 1051, 9; 1052, 7; 1099, 6; 1100, 10.

<sup>2</sup>The Oxyrhynchus Papyri XI 905, 4; XII 1473, 33 and 35.

<sup>3</sup>Greek Papyri in the British Museum, V, 1713, 16.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. LXX III Maccabees 4:6, *πρὸς βίου κοινωνίαν χρημικόν*; Aristotle Ethica Magna I 33, 18: *ἐν γυναικὶ καὶ ἀνδρὶ κοινωνία*; Philo De Specialibus Legibus I 109: *ἐν γάμου κοινωνίᾳ*; Plato Leges IV 721 A: *ἡ τῶν γάμων σύμμιξις καὶ κοινωνία*; Isocrates III 40: *ὅσοι γυναικὶ λαβόντες καὶ κοινωνίαν ποιησάμενοι πάντος τοῦ βίου*; Josephus Antiquitates Judaicae 1, 304: *εἴτα λεύεις, κοινωνίᾳ ὅσον βεβαιωτῆς*.

<sup>5</sup>Philo De Congressu Quaerendae Eruditionis Gratia 121; De Opificio Mundi 152; Josephus Contra Apionem I 35; Plutarch's Lives II 145 D. Athenaeus 2, 69 C.

Two other less frequently occurring kinds of genitive are in evidence with *κοινωνία*. One is the subjective genitive in which the genitive corresponds to the subject of the verb *κοινωνεῖω*.<sup>1</sup>

When this is used either the genitive includes all those who participate in something, or associate with one another as in Aristotle *Politica* III 1, 13 (1276 b): εἴπερ γάρ ἐστι κοινωνία τις ἡ πόλις, ἐστὶ δὲ κοινωνία πολιτῶν πολιτείᾳς, or explicit reference is made to the other parties by the dative or its equivalent.<sup>2</sup>

A good example of this is Plato *Respublica* V 466 C: τὴν τῶν γυναικῶν κοινωνίαν τοῖς ἀνδράσιν, ἣν διεληλύθαμεν παιδείας τε πέρι καὶ παίδων καὶ φύλακῆς τῶν ἄλλων πολιτῶν.<sup>3</sup>

The second kind of genitive is that with the person other than the subjective genitive. Very rarely is it a true objective genitive used in place of the dative of the person with whom one shares something or associates. One instance considered such by both Seesemann<sup>4</sup> and Hauck<sup>5</sup> is Plato *Sophista* 264 E: Παλιν τοῖς ἐπιχειρῶμεν σκίζοντες διχῇ τὸ προτεθεὶς γένος, πορευεσθαι κατὰ

<sup>1</sup>Campbell, p. 357 in his study, found this once in every eight occurrences of *κοινωνία*, not counting the absolute uses.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 358. Hauck, p. 798.

<sup>3</sup>Hauck, p. 358, cites this as objective genitive indicating that the two kinds of genitives can overlap when the subjective genitive refers to a person.

<sup>4</sup>Seesemann, p. 16, remarks "Mir scheint hier diese einzigartige Verbindung mit dem Gen. pers. deshalb erfolgt, weil *κοινωνία* prägnant im Hinblick auf die im folgenden Nebensatz stehenden Worte: ἕως ἂν αὐτοῦ τὰ κοινὰ . . . gesetzt ist."

<sup>5</sup>Hauck, p. 358.



υ/ Τὸ πρὸς δὲ διὰ τοῦτο μέρος τοῦ τμηθέντος, ἐχόμενοι τῆς τοῦ σοφιστοῦ κοινωρίας, ἕως ἂν αὐτοῦ τὰ κοινὰ πάντα περιελόντες, τὴν οἰκείαν λιπόντες φύσιν ἐπισδείξωμεν μάλιστα μὲν ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς, ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἐγγυτάτω γένει τῆς τοιαύτης μεθόδου.<sup>1</sup> Περύκοσιν. /

Other instances are confined to those contexts in which κοινωρία has acquired a special significance as association in marriage<sup>2</sup> or business,<sup>3</sup> or has departed otherwise from its normal meaning.<sup>4</sup> Many of these, however, like Plato Respublica 449 D: καὶ ὅλην ταύτην ἦν λέχεις κοινωρίαν γυναικῶν τε καὶ παίδων are really

<sup>1</sup>Campbell, pp. 357f. takes κοινωρία in the concrete sense of "society" and considers the genitive to be the ordinary possessive. Athenaeus 2, 69 C: ὅποτε γυναικὸς λαμβάνοι κοινωρίαν and Plutarch's Lives II 145 D: παῖδιον μὲν γὰρ οὐδεμία ποτὲ λέγεται ποιῆσαι δίχα κοινωρίας ἀνδρός, both referring to sexual intercourse, are the only examples admitted by him. But see next footnote.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Aristotle Politica I 1, 5 (1252b); ἐν δὲ τοῖς βαρβάροις τὸ θῆλυ καὶ δούλον τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχει τάξιν· αἷτιον δ' ὅτι τὸ φύσει ἄρχον οὐκ ἔχουσιν, ἀλλὰ γίνεται ἡ κοινωρία αὐτῶν δουλῆς καὶ δούλου.  
Philo De Specialibus Legibus I 104: εἰς κοινωρίαν ἱερῶν γυναικῶν, Euripides Bacchae 1276: See above p. 20.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Papiri Florentini, ed. G. Vitelli and De. Companetti (Milan 1906-1915), 3 Vols., 41, 5: κατὰ κοινωρίαν Ἀρτεμίδωρος; 13, 10: κτεῖντα κοινωρίαν τῆς σῆς ἀδελφῆς. These are cited from Seesemann, pp. 15f. Cf. also The Oxyrhynchus Papyri 103, 8.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Plato Leges V 729 C: συγγείαια δὲ καὶ δημογυνῶν θεῶν κοινωρίαν ἅπασαν ταῦτοῦ φύσιν αἵματος ἔχουσαν τιμῶν τις καὶ σεβόμενος εὖνους ἂν γενεθλίου θεοῦ εἰς παῖδων αὐτοῦ σπορὰν ἴσχοι κατὰ λόγον.  
Philo Legum Allegoriarum I 8: καὶ ἄρκτος ἐπὶ τὰ ἄστροις συμπληρούται, κοινωρίας καὶ ἐνώσεως ἀνθρώπων, οὐκ ἐπιμιδίας αὐτομόνου, οὐσία αἵτια.

the genitive of the thing shared.<sup>1</sup> Thus Campbell concludes rightly that

when a genitive is used with *κοινωνία* it is highly probable that it is a genitive of the thing shared, and that even if the noun in question happens to denote persons; this probability becomes almost certainty unless either the genitive clearly includes all those who share in something or associate with one another, or those with whom they associate are clearly mentioned.<sup>2</sup>

Though the idea of participation is the first and occasionally the exclusive meaning of *κοινωνία*, the thought of association is commonly present, as is evident from most of the above citations. This is expressed infrequently by the dative either in company with a genitive<sup>3</sup> or alone,<sup>4</sup> more often by a prepositional phrase,<sup>5</sup> usually *πρός*, and can be indicated or implied in the context apart from any dependent construction for that purpose.<sup>6</sup> This sense can and does play a large role when *κοινωνία* is used apart from any qualifying construction as illustrated by Aristotle Ethica Nicomachea VIII 12: *Ἐκ κοινωνίας*

<sup>1</sup>Also Plato Respublica V 461 E, 464 B, but not 466 C p. 21 above.

<sup>2</sup>Campbell, p. 358.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Euripides Iphigenia Taurica 254, quoted on p. 18 above.

<sup>4</sup>Plato Sophista 257 A: *Ὁὐ γάρ, δὴ καὶ τὰυτὰ οὐ συσχερατῶν, ἐπεὶ περ ἔχει κοινωνίαν ἀλλήλοις*. Also infrequent is the dative of the thing shared. See above pp. 14 f.

<sup>5</sup>*ἐς* : Plato Sophista 251 E; *ἐν* : Philo De Confusione Linguarum 12, 13 and 83; *περί* : Plato Timaeus 60 D and Symposium 188 (*πρός* is also found in the latter, both prepositions performing the function of the associative dative); *πρός* : Epictetus II 20, 6 and Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum 646, 53, both of which also contain a dative of the person.

<sup>6</sup>Cf. Plato Respublica 462 B above page 19 and the following citations.

μὲν οὐτ' πᾶσα Φιλία ἐστίν, καθάπερ εἰρήται .<sup>1</sup> It is difficult to be certain how exclusive this sense is in any particular instance, but often it can be said to constitute the dominant force of the term.

Though κοινωρία used absolutely can run the gamut of the meanings set forth above, it can not ordinarily be severed from at least the overtones of its basic definition. This is not only when one of the ideas of participation or association predominates, but also in many of its more specialized uses. This is what allows κοινωρία its unique usefulness.<sup>2</sup>

Two very similar special uses ought to be pointed out. The first, most obvious in Philo, is one that employs κοινωρία to connote an attitude of mind or attribute of character. Philo includes it in a list of traits which characterize virtue, De Sacrificiis Abelis et Caini 27: συγκρίνοντο δὲ αὐτῇ εὐσέβεια δσιότης ἀλήθεια θέμις ἀχιστεία εὐορκία δικαιοσύνη ἰσότης εὐσυνθεσία κοινωρία ἐχεθυμία σωφροσύνη . . .<sup>3</sup> Very close to this is the meaning "communicativeness"<sup>4</sup> corresponding to κοινωρέω in the

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Marcus Aurelius XI 8, 4 and Philo De Ebrietate 84.

<sup>2</sup>An observation of the frequent use of κοινωρία in Aristotle Ethica Nicomachea 9, 1-6 amply illustrates this paragraph.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. De Virtutibus 80 and 84 and Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit 91. The latter is in description of the Essenes. Also Josephus De Bello Judaico VII 264.

<sup>4</sup>In the sense of "readiness or willingness to give a share," i.e. "generosity." Cf. A. Raymond George, Communion with God in the New Testament (London: The Epworth Press, 1953), p. 133.



sense of "to give a share."<sup>1</sup> Only two examples of this use are available from non-Christian literature,<sup>2</sup> Gnomologium Epicteteum Stobaei 43: Τὸ

μὲν γύψῳ λευκανθίσουσιν σπουδάσειν θαυμάζεσθαι τὴν οἰκίαν ἀπειροκάλου, τὸ δὲ ἦθος χρηστότητι κοινωρίας λαμπρύνειν ἅμα καὶ φιλανθρώπου 3

and Corpus Hermeticum 13, 9: ἔκτλην δούριμιν καλῶ εἰς ἡμᾶς τὴν κατὰ τῆς πλεονεξίας, (τὴν) κοινωρίαν. ἀποτάσῃς δὲ (τῆς) πλεονεξίας . . .<sup>4</sup>

Both Liddell-Scott<sup>5</sup> and Arndt and Gingrich<sup>6</sup> allow the above sense to become concrete denoting a charitable contribution. Apart from Leviticus 5:27<sup>7</sup> mentioned by Arndt and Gingrich, the only support given<sup>8</sup> is a third century inscription from Polga of Tarsus.<sup>9</sup> According to See-

<sup>1</sup>See above p. 13<sup>R</sup> for the derivation of this meaning.

<sup>2</sup>Numerous examples can be found in early Christian Literature. Cf. Seesemann, p. 31.

<sup>3</sup>H. Schenkl, Epicteti Dissertationes Ab Arriano Digestae (Lip-  
siae: In Aedibus B. G. Teubneri, 1894), p. 473.

<sup>4</sup>Nock and Festugière, II, 204.

<sup>5</sup>Liddell-Scott, p. 970.

<sup>6</sup>Arndt and Gingrich, p. 440. Also Bauer, p. 795.

<sup>7</sup>Discussed on the next page.

<sup>8</sup>Radermacher, p. 10 and Seesemann, p. 23 state that it is the only possible example apart from the New Testament and Early Christian Literature.

<sup>9</sup>Arndt and Gingrich and probably Liddell-Scott rely upon the following statement from Radermacher, p. 10, who in turn follows the interpretation of Adolph Wilhelm: "κοινωνία im paulinischen Sinn von 'Beisteuer' war bisher nicht bekannt. Jetzt wird dieser Sinn von Ad. Wilhelm auch für eine kleinasiatische Inschrift aus Polga am Tarsus (Jahresh. des Österr. arch. Inst. IV Beiblatt S. 37ff.) angenommen." Radermacher, however, in a later article labels it a provincialism "dessen paulinische

semann,<sup>1</sup> however, this interpretation of *κοινωνία* from this inscription is at least uncertain if not definitely incorrect. Neither does LXX Leviticus 5:21<sup>2</sup> afford any support for this rendering,<sup>3</sup> for though the Hebrew is  $\text{תָּרַם בְּיָדוֹ אֶת הַקֶּדֶשׁ}$ , "deposit" or "pledge,"<sup>4</sup> the Greek corresponds to the Targum rendering of  $\text{אֲרַם בְּיָדוֹ אֶת הַקֶּדֶשׁ}$ , "eig. in Gemeinschaftlichkeit der Hand, d. h. ein Gut, welches einige Theilnehmer, Genossen gemeinschaftlich zu verwalten haben."<sup>5</sup> The Greek most likely goes back to the same tradition upon which the Targum is based at this point.<sup>6</sup> Thus *κοινωνία* would mean little more than a normal "common" or "joint" in this instance.

Bedeutung rein zufällig in einer Inschrift aus Polga am Tarsus zutage getreten ist." *σφραγίσσεται*: Rm 15 28, "Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft (1933) p. 89.

<sup>1</sup> Seesemann, pp. 22f. He discusses this passage in detail. The inscription in honour of a citizen is quoted by him as follows:

Ἰεδωκότα διαγομᾶς ἔτεσι πολίτειάς  
βουλευτῆς τε καὶ ἐκκλησιαστῆς (sic) [καὶ ἡγ-  
οσι πολεῖταις, κτίστοντα ἔργα τῇ πόλει, κρεί-  
νοντα τοπικὰ δικαστήρια ἔτεσι κοινω-  
νίας], πέμψαντα ἀνθρώπων εἰς τὸ Ἀλεξανδρῶν ἔθνος. . .

<sup>2</sup> The only other two instances of *κοινωνία* in the LXX have already been mentioned, Wisdom of Solomon 8:18 on p. 19 and III Maccabees 4:6 on p. 20 in footnote 4. It occurs also in Quinta Hosea 7:4 cited on p. 19 above.

<sup>3</sup> Against Hermann L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1926), III, 316.

<sup>4</sup> Brown, Driver and Briggs, p. 965. The Hebrew word is an Hapex Legomenon in the OT with its own difficulties.

<sup>5</sup> J. Levy, *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim und einen grossen Theil des rabbinischen Schriftthums* (Leipzig: Verlag von Baumgärtner's Buchhandlung, 1868), II, 523.

<sup>6</sup> Seesemann, pp. 29-31. Cf. Hauck, p. 801.

## Summary

The preceding study of koinonia and cognates outside the New Testament can be summed up as follows:

The fundamental meaning of koinonos, koinoneo and koinonia centers in the dual idea of "having something in common with someone else," varying of course with the function of each as an adjective used as a noun, a verb and an abstract noun. The sharing in is normally expressed by a genitive and the association by a dative.

The primary or governing idea is that of having a share or participation which is indicated in part by the relative frequency of the genitive. That this idea is primary is especially evident with koinonos for it shows only a minimum tendency to allow the thought of association to rise above a secondary role.

In any given instance of the words either emphasis can assume predominance which in turn leads to varied derivative uses. This happens more with koinoneo than with koinonos and is especially true of koinonia. It is important to note that the emphasizing of one phase of meaning does not necessarily entirely exclude the other, and even when the use is a derived one the general connotation of the koinonia words must be kept in mind in order properly to assess and appreciate the particular denotation. It would be quite arbitrary to attempt to be exclusive in the isolation of different meanings, for a particular word is often used for its overtones as well as for its direct significance in a given context. Such distinctions can only be made on the basis of the particular emphasis.



## CHAPTER II

### KOINONIA AND COGNATES, AN ANALYSIS OF THEIR USE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

#### Implications for the New Testament

The implications of the preceding chapter for the study of koinonia and cognates in the New Testament are significant. The most important is the confirmation of the thought of "sharing in" or "participation" as the ruling idea.<sup>1</sup> This has been recognized all along by most New Testament researchers but not always unanimously in respect to koinonia.<sup>2</sup> Since, however, the definitive studies of J. Y. Campbell (1932) and H. Seesemann (1933) rooted in non-New Testament usage,<sup>3</sup> this point has been clarified to the satisfaction of most. Hauck's

---

<sup>1</sup>This fact is disguised but not necessarily denied by Liddell-Scott which lists for koinonia such meanings as "communion," "association," "partnership," "society," "fellowship," and "joint ownership," p. 970.

<sup>2</sup>J. A. Robinson, "Communion," A Dictionary of the Bible, ed. James Hastings (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1898), I, 460-62, wrote concerning koinonia: "Fellowship is the ruling idea of the word and we must not lose sight of it." Likewise C. Anderson Scott in a series of studies beginning with "The Communion of the Body," The Expositor, ed. W. R. Nicoll (8th Series, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1919), XVIII, 121-130, has a tendency to deny the primacy of participation.

<sup>3</sup>Only these two and Hauck in Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, III, made any real use of non-New Testament sources, though William S. Wood, "Fellowship," The Expositor, ed. W. R. Nicoll (8th Series, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1921), XXL, 33-40, appealed in general to such sources in his refutation of C. Anderson Scott.

article in Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, III (1938), based largely on the above studies, has furnished the foundation for the majority of recent treatments in both monographs and commentaries.

This ruling idea can assume three predominant emphases. First and fundamental is that of "having a share" which is expressed particularly though not exclusively with the genitive or its prepositional substitute. This emphasis is often present apart from any case construction and can also be indicated by the dative. Secondly, it is possible for the verb and the noun to be used actively in the sense of "giving a share." The linking case construction, when there is one, is normally the dative or its equivalent. Although rooted in the basic meaning of the word-group this use is quite rare until after New Testament times, so in its application to the New Testament only its possibility and not its frequency can be assumed. The third emphasis which likewise stems from the first meaning is that of "sharing" seen primarily in its horizontal implications which of course has arisen out of the common sharing of something. The latter emphasis is often rendered by "fellowship" which can be misleading in that it has a tendency to obscure the root concept. Particularly when it is used to translate the first sense above as in the Authorized Version can "fellowship" lead to ambiguity.

Just as important as the recognition of "sharing in" as the ruling idea, is the recognition of the essentiality of the secondary idea of association in the sharing. This explains the third emphasis of the previous paragraph. The two-fold direction of the words is essential to their basic significance and should not be lost sight of

unless demanded by the context. Campbell<sup>1</sup> has a disposition to stress a little too strongly at times the exclusiveness of the idea of participation.

Particularly with koinoneo and koinonia can the secondary significance of association dominate the usage. The main question here is not the possibility of this, but what degree of intimacy are the koinonia words capable of carrying in this sense: is it secondary or primary in the particular usage? The use of koinonos and koinoneo to translate the 77 words in the LXX as well as the frequent employment of koinonos and koinonia in marriage and sexual contexts certainly leave room for the expression of intimate association. One may perhaps speak as does G. V. Jourdan of their "capacity for conveying the sense of an inward union"<sup>2</sup> if it is clearly kept in mind that such is rooted in a common participation in something.

Finally the ability of koinonia as an abstract noun to assume a multitude of derivative meanings must be kept in mind. These, however, cannot be fully appreciated apart from their relation to the first significance of koinonia.

In this chapter the purpose is to examine each of the occurrences of koinonia and cognates in the literature of the New Testament with a view to defining their primary meaning in each instance and noting the context in which they are employed. Upon the basis of this analysis a synthesis will be attempted in terms of the character of, any development in and the main idea or ideas involved in the use of the

---

<sup>1</sup>Campbell, pp. 354ff.

<sup>2</sup>Jourdan, p. 111.



terminology. The aim at this point is not to explore the implications of the use and theological bearing of the language, but to lay a linguistic foundation for such a task to be pursued in the remainder of the study.

### The Koinonia Language in Paul

The investigation in this chapter will proceed according to the various literature blocks, beginning with Paul and then dealing with the remainder of the New Testament in order. Paul is considered first mainly because he makes more frequent and complete use of the terminology than does any other New Testament writer. In fact twenty-six<sup>1</sup> of the total of forty-two occurrences of the language in the New Testament are found in the Pauline Literature. An examination of Paul's fuller use may be helpful in furnishing a criterion by which to evaluate the more sparse employment of koinonia and cognates in the rest of the New Testament. As in the preceding chapter the order of koinonos, koinoneo, koinonia will be adhered to.

Koinonos.--The simplest to analyse of Paul's uses of koinonos is II Corinthians 8:23, εἶτε ὑπὲρ τίτου, κοινῶς ἑμὸς καὶ εἰς ὑμᾶς συνεργός,<sup>2</sup> for a parallel noun is present.<sup>3</sup> Thus

<sup>1</sup>Not counting the occurrence of κοινωρικὸς in I Tim. 6:18 next to εὐμεταΐδος meaning 'liberal' or 'generous'. Arndt and Gingrich, p. 440. It occurs only here in the New Testament and never in the LXX. Cf. Polybius 2, 44, 1; Josephus De Bello Judaico 2, 122.

<sup>2</sup>All New Testament Greek references will be taken from Eberhard Nestle, Novum Testamentum Graece, ed. Erwin Nestle and D. Kurt Aland (23rd ed.; Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1957).

<sup>3</sup>Xenophon Memorabilia II 6, 26:

koinonos is used quite naturally as "a partner in a common enterprise."<sup>1</sup> The two nouns need not be exactly synonymous as Campbell insists,<sup>2</sup> rather only roughly so, with koinonos laying perhaps more stress on the relationship between Paul and Titus.<sup>3</sup> This tendency is normal when koinonos is used absolutely.<sup>4</sup> The basis of the partnership is the work of the Gospel as other Pauline uses of συνεργός (cf. Rom. 16:3; Phil. 2:25; Col. 4:11; I Th. 3:2; Philem. 1, 24) would indicate.

Very similar and with the same commercial background<sup>5</sup> as II Corinthians 8:23 is the use of koinonos in Philemon 17, ἐν οὗν με ἔχεις κοινωνόν, προσλαβοῦ αὐτόν ὡς ἐμέ. The request, προσλαβοῦ αὐτόν ὡς ἐμέ, lays emphasis on the bond of unity<sup>6</sup> resulting from their common participation in the Christian faith.<sup>7</sup> Without recourse at this point to the problematic ἡ κοινωνία τῆς

<sup>1</sup>See above p. 6.

<sup>2</sup>Campbell, p. 362.

<sup>3</sup>So Jourdan, p. 114, comments: "there was more in his thought than the recognition of his colleague's practical assistance in the work of evangelization."

<sup>4</sup>See the discussion above pp. 6-10.

<sup>5</sup>John Knox, The Epistle to Philemon in Vol. XI of The Interpreter's Bible, ed. Nolan B. Harmon (New York: Abingdon Cokesbury, 1955), p. 570. See The Amherst Papyri 92, 18 (AD 162-163) quoted above on p. 7.

<sup>6</sup>Here one could possibly posit the influence of the Hebrew יָד בְּיָד in the New Testament use of koinonos. See above pp. 7-10

<sup>7</sup>Ernst Lohmeyer, Die Briefe an die Philipper, an die Kolosser und an Philemon, Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament (8th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1930), p. 189, writes here of "die Verbundenheit des Bruders mit dem Bruder im Glauben."

κοινωνία of verse 6,<sup>1</sup> the fact that their shared faith is the essence of the bond is suggested by the emphatic use of ἀδελφός<sup>2</sup> (7, 20; cf. 1, 16) and the general tone, purpose and appeal of the letter.<sup>3</sup> Any personal friendship, though possibly true, is secondary, for the appeal is primarily a Christian one. Thus the main force of koinonos here, even more so than in II Corinthians 8:23, is on the spiritual relationship between Paul and Philemon.<sup>4</sup>

The remaining uses of koinonos (I Cor. 10:18, 20; II Cor. 1:7) and sunakoinonos (Rom. 11:17; I Cor. 9:23; Phil. 1:7) by Paul are all with the genitive. Passing over I Corinthians 10:18, 20 which can be better evaluated in the context of the discussion of the whole passage in connection with koinonia,<sup>5</sup> these are cases of the normal partitive

<sup>1</sup>See below pp. 46ff.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. C. F. D. Moule, The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Colossians and to Philemon, The Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary, ed. C. F. D. Moule (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1958), p. 147, for a concise up-to-date discussion with references to the pertinent literature on the Christian significance of this designation.

<sup>3</sup>As traditionally interpreted, for example, as by Moule in the work just cited. If one were to accept partially or wholly the views of John Knox, pp. 555-560 in The Interpreter's Bible and set forth more fully in Philemon Among the Letters of St. Paul (revised ed.; New York: Abingdon Press, 1959), pp. 56-70, this point would thereby be further enhanced. For if the appeal is really to Archippus as the slave-owner addressed through Philemon as the head of the church, the use of this round-about method would preclude any close personal friendship between Paul and Archippus. Thus they could only be koinonoi in terms of a common faith and the appeal would be on the exclusive basis of this relationship in the Gospel.

<sup>4</sup>J. A. T. Robinson, The Body (London: S. C. M. Press, 1952), p. 58, applying his view of "the Church as literally now the resurrection body of Christ" to Philem. 17 interprets "κοινωνός --i.e., a partaker of Christ."

<sup>5</sup>See below pp. 48-60.



genitive which indicate that the ruling idea is sharing or participation.<sup>1</sup>

This is evident in II Corinthians 1:7, καὶ ἡ ἐλπίς ἡμῶν βεβαία ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν εἰδότες ὅτι ὡς κοινωνοὶ ἐστέ τῶν παθημάτων, οὕτως καὶ τῆς παρακλήσεως,<sup>2</sup> where Paul writes to the Corinthians concerning their sharing the same kind<sup>3</sup> of sufferings (τῶν αὐτῶν παθημάτων) as he; therefore partaking of the same comfort (διὰ τῆς παρακλήσεως ἧς παρακαλούμεθα αὐτοὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ) which finds its source in Christ (διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ).<sup>4</sup> Likewise the sufferings which are shared are designated as τὰ παθήματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ (v. 5).<sup>5</sup> Though the weight of meaning is on the "having a share in," at the same time it is a mistake to lose sight of the fact that the unique nature of the relationship which is rooted in this "sharing in" is included in Paul's employment of koinonos.

It remains now to examine the occurrences of sunkoinonos which differ from koinonos only in the un mistakeableness of their inclusion

<sup>1</sup>See above p. 3.

<sup>2</sup>Josephus Antiquitates Judaicae 4, 177: Ἄνθρωποι συστράτιῳ τῇ καὶ τῆς μακρᾶς κοινωνοὶ τῆς λαλῆσις.

<sup>3</sup>Alfred Plummer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, the International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1915), p. 14.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 15.

<sup>5</sup>Heinz-Dietrich Wendland, Die Briefe an die Korinther, Das Neue Testament Deutsch, ed. Paul Althaus (7th revised ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1954), p. 145, "die ganze Gemeinde bekommt am Kreuz und Leiden Anteil."

of the *συν* idea.<sup>1</sup> First in appearance is Romans 11:17, *σὺ δὲ ἄγριέλαιος ὢν ἐρεκεντρίσθης ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ συγκαινωνὸς τῆς ῥίξης τῆς πιότητος τῆς ἐλαίας ἐγένου*, where the heathen who have become Christians are represented in Paul's analogy as now belonging to the main stock of the people of God and are with the believing Jews partakers of its privileges and benefits which "in practice . . . amount to the supernatural life of the people of God in the last age."<sup>2</sup>

Similar<sup>3</sup> is I Corinthians 9:23, *πάντα δὲ ποιῶ διὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ἵνα συγκαινωνὸς αὐτοῦ γένωμαι*. Paul conceives of his own salvation and apostleship as inseparable,<sup>4</sup> for he does *πάντα* (including both verses 1-22 and 24-27) that along with those to whom he has laboured he might partake in τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, which includes the *ἄφθαρτον στέφανον* of verse 25: *μή πως ἄλλοις κηρύξας αὐτὸς ἁδόκιμος γένωμαι* (v. 27).

The last occurrence of *sunkoinonos* in Paul is Philippians 1:7, *καθὼς ἐστὶν δίκαιον ἐμοὶ τοῦτο φροεῖν ὑπὲρ πάντων ὑμῶν, διὰ τὸ ἔχειν με ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμᾶς, ἐν τε τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀπολογίᾳ καὶ βεβαιώσει τοῦ εὐαγγελίου συγκαινωνός μου τῆς χάριτος πάντας*

<sup>1</sup>James H. Moulton and W. F. Howard, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1929), II, 324f.

<sup>2</sup>C. K. Barrett, *The Epistle to the Romans* (London: A. & G. Black, 1957), p. 217.

<sup>3</sup>D. Hans Lietzmann, *An die Korinther I, II*, Vol. IX, *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*, ed. G. Bornkamm (4th revised ed. Werner Georg Kummel; Tübingen: Verlag J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1949), p. 43.

<sup>4</sup>Wendland, p. 68.

ὡς ὄντας . The usage is normal; Paul views the church at Philippi as a partaker with him τῆς χάριτος.<sup>1</sup> Paul has foremost in mind ἐν τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀπολογίᾳ καὶ βεβαιώσει τοῦ εὐαγγελίου as the current expressions of "la grâce par excellence . . . l'apostolat parmi les nations."<sup>2</sup> It is this "absolute grace of God,"<sup>3</sup> manifested in the gospel,<sup>4</sup> now present in Paul's sufferings and at stake in his struggle,<sup>5</sup> which is partaken of by the Philippian church through their sympathetic love, understanding and concrete aid to the apostle.<sup>6</sup>

The previous two occurrences of sunkoinonos in Paul (Rom. 11:17;

<sup>1</sup>μου is better taken with συγκαινωνούς for "when Paul speaks of the grace peculiar to himself he never says μου ἡ χάρις or ἡ χάρις μου, but ἡ χάρις ἡ δοθεῖσα μοι (Gal. ii. 9; I Cor. iii. 10; Rom. xii. 3, xv. 15); or ἡ χάρις αὐτοῦ ἡ εἰς ἐμὲ (I Cor. xv. 10)." Marvin Vincent, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Philippians and to Philemon, The International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1897), p. 10. But Lohmeyer, p. 25, appealing to the συγκαινωνήσαρτές μου τῇ θλίψει of 4:14 takes μου with τῆς χάριτος . So also E. F. Scott, The Epistle to the Philippians in Vol. XI of The Interpreter's Bible, ed. Nolan B. Harmon (New York: Abingdon Cokesbury, 1955), p. 25.

<sup>2</sup>Pierre Bonnard, L'Épître de Saint Paul aux Philippiens in Vol. X of Commentaire du Nouveau Testament (Neuchâtel and Paris: Delachaux and Niestlé S. A., 1950), p. 17.

<sup>3</sup>Vincent, p. 10.

<sup>4</sup>The use of koinonia in verse 5 is significant for the understanding of this passage. See below pp. 51 ff.

<sup>5</sup>E. F. Scott, p. 25. Lohmeyer, pp. 25f., aptly comments: "Es ist das Einzigartige, dass das persönliche Geschick des Pls. und das sachliche Geschick des Evangeliums jetzt unlöslich verbunden sind; indem Pls. sich verantwortet, ja indem er gefesselt ist, verteidigt er das Evangelium."

<sup>6</sup>Cr. 4:10-20 discussed below pp. 39f. and 44f.



I Cor. 9:23) show less tendency than koinonos towards the inclusion of the idea of a spiritual bond of unity and imply no more than "participation along with." In contrast, a sense of spiritual oneness is intimated in Philippians 1:7 by both the object and exercise of their participation. In the light of the total context of the letter<sup>1</sup> sunkoinonos in this passage uniquely combines at least the thoughts of "having a share" and "giving a share," for the former is dependent on the latter.

Koinoneo.--With the exception of Philippians 4:15 all the occurrences of the verb (including sunkoinoneo) in Paul are with the dative of the thing. The normal significance of this construction according to classical analogy is "to have to do with."<sup>2</sup> It is the usual dative of association. Two infrequently met other possibilities which are important for the problem at hand have already been pointed out in the previous chapter. One is the dative of the thing shared,<sup>3</sup> "participate in," and the other is "to give a share."<sup>4</sup>

Considering first the possible use of the dative to express the thing shared in the Pauline literature, Seesemann considers it a refined

<sup>1</sup>Bonnard, p. 17, appropriately writes of συγκοινωνούς μου τῆς χάριτος as "la clé de tout le passage" and as "caractérisent l'épître tout entière."

<sup>2</sup>See above p. 14.

<sup>3</sup>See above p. 15.

<sup>4</sup>See above pp. 12-14. Two post-New Testament Christian examples are the Didache IV 8: οὐκ ἀποστράφησῃ τὸν ἐχθρόν σου καὶ οὐκ ἐρεῖς ἰδία εἶρας. and Barnabas XIX 8: κοινωθήσεῖς ἐν πᾶσι τῷ πλησίον σου καὶ οὐκ ἐρεῖς ἰδία εἶρας.

usage in which the dative is viewed as a substitute for the genitive.<sup>1</sup> The most certain<sup>2</sup> example of the dative of the thing shared is Romans 15:27, ἡὐδοκῆσαρ γάρ, καὶ ὁφείλεται εἰς οὖν αὐτῶν· εἴ γάρ τοῖς πνευματικοῖς αὐτῶν ἐκοινῶνῆσαρ τὰ ἔθνη, ὁφείλουσιν καὶ ἐν τοῖς σαρκικοῖς λειτουργῆσαρ αὐτοῖς. The meaning in the light of the preceding two verses<sup>3</sup> is obviously that the Gentiles have come to share in the spiritual blessings which have emanated from the Jerusalem Church. The emphasis is on αὐτῶν as the instrumental source, but at the same time the thought of these spiritual blessings as a common possession is an integral part of Paul's thought in his use of koinoneo. It is this mutual sharing<sup>4</sup> in a Gospel which came to the Gentiles from Jerusalem that is the adequate motivation for the felt willingness and obligation of the Gentile

<sup>1</sup>Seesemann, p. 32f. He cites for support the rule: "der (partitive) Gen. bei 'nehmen von, essen von' usw. wird im NT . . . durch präpositionale Wendungen oder auch durch andere Kasus ersetzt. . . so hat κοινῶναι nur H 2 14 den Gen., während Paul, Petr. Joh. den Dat. oder eine Präp. brauchen." Friedrich Blass and Albert Debrunner, Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch (8th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1949), p. 80. Included by Seesemann in this category are Rom. 15:27, Eph. 5:11, I Tim. 5:22, I Peter 4:13, II John 11 and Rev. 18:4. Illustrations of this dative in place of the genitive in Greek are quoted by Seesemann on p. 33 from second century sources.

<sup>2</sup>Campbell, p. 369, calls this the only certain instance in the New Testament.

<sup>3</sup>"At present, however, I am going to Jerusalem with aid (διακο- νῶν) for the saints. For Macedonia and Achaia have been pleased to make some contribution (κοινωνίαν τινα) for the poor among the saints at Jerusalem." vv. 25-26.

<sup>4</sup>Hauck, p. 808, speaks of a "Verbundenheitsverhältnis." Ernst Gaugler, Der Römerbrief, Prophezei (Zurich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1945), p. 385f., notes that "die Gabe nicht bloss eine notwendige Unterstützung ist, sondern ein Ausdruck der Gemeinschaft."

churches "to be of service to them in material blessings." Though "sharing in" is the primary force, the other dimension also has its role to play in this employment of koinoneo. The sharing is in terms of the spiritual blessings of the Gospel. The larger context, however, of the Apostle's koinonia language at this point is the material aid  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$

τοὺς πτωχοὺς τῶν ἀγίων τῶν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ.<sup>1</sup>

Philippians 4:14,  $\pi\lambda\eta\gamma\eta\kappa\alpha\lambda\omega\varsigma\ \epsilon\pi\omicron\iota\kappa\eta\sigma\alpha\tau\epsilon\ \sigma\upsilon\gamma\kappa\omicron\iota\nu\omega\nu\eta\sigma\alpha\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \mu\omicron\upsilon\tau\eta\ \theta\lambda\acute{\iota}\psi\epsilon\iota$ , could possibly be taken as a dative of the thing shared. But since the "sharing in" is in terms of sympathy and thoughtfulness expressed in their material aid to Paul,<sup>2</sup> the usual force of "have common cause with" fully accounts for this dative.<sup>3</sup> The difference would in reality be slight, thus showing how the dative of the thing shared may have developed out of the use of the dative of the thing with which common cause is made.<sup>4</sup> The context of thought is identical to that expressed in 1:7 by  $\sigma\upsilon\gamma\kappa\omicron\iota\nu\omega\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \mu\omicron\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma\ \chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\tau\omicron\varsigma$ .<sup>5</sup> The stress rests on their sharing<sup>6</sup>  $\tau\eta\ \theta\lambda\acute{\iota}\psi\epsilon\iota$  of Paul,

<sup>1</sup>Rom. 15:26.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. vv. 15-18.

<sup>3</sup>J. B. Lightfoot, Saint Paul's Epistle to the Philippians (London: Macmillan and Co., 1888), p. 164, paraphrases "by making common cause with my affliction, by your readiness to share the burden of my troubles." Thus also most authorities since.

<sup>4</sup>Campbell, p. 366.

<sup>5</sup>Lohmeyer, p. 183: "genau analogen Wort." See above pp. 35f and note the contrast with II Cor. 1:7 above pp. 34f.

<sup>6</sup>This participation language though in one sense ambiguously portraying the literal Greek construction, is still the best way to express the thought of this phrase. The RSV, for example, translates, "to share my troubles." This fact shows how close the two Greek usages are in this passage.



and this as Lohmeyer points out, "spricht . . . von der Herstellung einer 'Gemeinschaft'".<sup>1</sup> This is plainly evident from the *δόσεως* καὶ λήψεως of the following verse.

In the above example it has been seen how the one usage could well have blended into the other. This may well have taken place in the next two instances. The difficulty of precise distinction is apparent in Seesemann who considers the dative in Ephesians 5:11 and I Timothy 5:22<sup>2</sup> as genitive substitutes and the same time adheres to the normal force of the dative in translation.<sup>3</sup>

In Ephesians 5:11, καὶ μὴ συγκοινωνεῖτε τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς ἀκρότοις τοῦ σκότους, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἐλέγχετε, either usage would give the meaning required by the context.

Since the warning includes along with the committing of such sins the toleration of them and fellowship with those who commit them,<sup>4</sup> one need not go beyond the normal "have nothing to do with."<sup>5</sup> But the unambiguous use of the dative of the thing shared in Romans 15:27 leaves the question

<sup>1</sup>Lohmeyer, p. 183. He immediately adds, "das sie auf die schöne Tat der Unterstützung sich begründet, ist der Sinn des Lobes."

<sup>2</sup>For the purposes of this chapter, these will be treated under the Pauline category without further justification.

<sup>3</sup>Seesemann, p. 32. "An allen diesen Stellen also I Pet. 4 13, II John 11 and Rev. 18 4 geht die Bedeutung von κοινῶνέω über 'teilhaben' zwar hinaus und kann vielleicht am besten mit 'verbunden sein, Gemeinschaft haben' wiedergegeben werden."

<sup>4</sup>F. W. Beare, The Epistle to the Ephesians, in Vol. X of The Interpreter's Bible, ed. Nolan B. Harmon (New York: Abingdon Cokesbury, 1953,) p. 710.

<sup>5</sup>Cf. Demosthenes De Falsa Legatione 334: στρατηγὸς δ' εἰ τις ἡδίκησεν ὑμᾶς οὐχὶ κοινῶνεί ταις νύκτεσσι.

open.<sup>1</sup>

Similar is I Timothy 5:22, *χεῖρας ταχέως μηδενὶ ἐπιτίθει, μηδὲ κοινῶρει ἁμαρτίας ἀλλοτρίαις· σεαυτὸν ἄγνον τήρει*,<sup>2</sup> where Timothy is urged not to make himself responsible<sup>3</sup> for the sins of others by ordaining<sup>4</sup> too hastily. The ordinary use of the dative can suffice here,<sup>5</sup> though the other would equally well give the proper sense.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Campbell, p. 368, because of the paucity of examples in earlier writers feels that it is best "not to give *κοινῶρειν* this sense in the New Testament if it is reasonably possible to avoid doing so."

<sup>2</sup>Artemidori Daldiani Onirocriticon Libri V, ed. Rudolph Hercher (Lipsiae: In Aedibus, B. G. Teubneri, 1864), III, 51:

*πάσχειν δὲ δοκεῖν τὰ αὐτὰ ἄλλω ὑποτιθεῖν γινώσκων, ὅσον τὸν αὐτὸν πόδα ἢ τὴν αὐτὴν χεῖρα ἢ ἄλλο τι μέρος τοῦ σώματος τὰ αὐτὰ πάσχειν καὶ ὅλως συγροσεῖν ἢ συλαχεῖν, κοινωρῆσαι σημαίνει τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων ἐκείνῳ.*

<sup>3</sup>Joachim Jeremias, *Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus*, Vol. IX, *Das Neue Testament Deutsch* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1953), p. 34 translates "mache dich nicht mitverantwortlich für die Sünden Anderer." Also see fn. 4 below.

<sup>4</sup>Whether the laying on of hands is for ordination or for the restoration of penitents does not appreciably affect the force of *koinoneo* here. The arguments for the latter are found fully in Robert Falconer, *The Pastoral Epistles* (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1937), pp. 150ff. and in Fred Gealy, *The First and Second Epistle to Timothy and the Epistle to Titus*, in Vol. XI, *The Interpreter's Bible*, ed. Nolan B. Harmon (New York: Abingdon Cokesbury, 1955), pp. 444f. For the former see E. F. Scott, *The Pastoral Epistles*, *The Moffatt New Testament Commentary* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1936), pp. 67f. The crux seems to be the relation of 5:22 to the preceding verses. Cf. Martin Dibelius, *Die Pastoralbriefe*, *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*, ed. Hans Lietzmann (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1931), pp. 50f.

<sup>5</sup>So Radermacher, p. 128.

<sup>6</sup>Arndt-Gingrich, p. 439, of this instance comment, "to share, participate in the deeds of others means to be equally responsible for them."

Since Romans 12:13, ταῖς χρείαις τῶν ἁγίων κοινωσόμετες , can possibly be either of the two usages just considered as well as "to give a share," it will be considered in transition. The RSV "contribute to the needs of the saints" is obviously the implied application of the text. Yet it does not necessarily follow that this represents the exact force of the Greek construction. Arndt and Gingrich would classify it in a category which seems to partake of both derivative uses of the dative of the thing: "Participation in someth. can reach such a degree that one claims a part in it for oneself take an interest in, share."<sup>1</sup> This fits in the explanation outlined above as "a not yet effected participation."<sup>2</sup> The examples given there contain the genitive only,<sup>3</sup> but if one does not stumble at the dative substituting for the genitive, this need not be a hindrance.<sup>4</sup> The possibility and plausibility of this must be conceded. One must, however, also recognize that the usual dative of association, "making common cause with needs of the saints,"<sup>5</sup> can adequately support the required meaning. The latter is broader and allows for the inclusion of that sympathetic feeling which would furnish the motive for the actual help given. As John Knox comments, "'sharing' is more than 'contributing'."<sup>6</sup> If one does accept the more refined u-

<sup>1</sup>Arndt and Gingrich, p. 439.

<sup>2</sup>See above, p. 12.

<sup>3</sup>LXX proverbs 1:11, κοινῶνησας αἵματος and Philostratus Vita Apollonii 5, 25: κοινῶρει τοῦ κακροῦ ἡμῶν  
The full quotations can be found above on p. 12.

<sup>4</sup>Seesemann, p. 26, would agree, translating "nimmt an den Bedürfnissen der Heiligen (hilfreich) teil."

<sup>5</sup>Campbell, p. 368.

<sup>6</sup>John Knox, The Epistle to the Romans, in Vol. IX of The Interp-



sage the overtones cannot be ignored. The thought is general; it is not a reference to the special Jerusalem offering.<sup>1</sup>

The unusual transitive sense "to give a share" for koinoneo most probably receives the stress in Galatians 6:6,<sup>2</sup> κοινωνεῖτω δὲ ὁ κατηχοούμενος τὸν λόγον τῷ κατηχοῦντι ἐν πᾶσι ἀγαθοῖς. In view of I Corinthians 9:7-14, II Thessalonians 3:8ff., II Corinthians 11:7ff., Philippians 4:10ff., I Timothy 5:17-18, Barnabas 19:8 and Didache 4:8,<sup>3</sup> it is most natural to assume that Paul was indeed concerned about the material support of those who taught in the Church. One need not limit πᾶσι ἀγαθοῖς to material goods, though Luke 12:18b "and there I will store all my grain and my goods (τὰ ἀγαθὰ μου) indicates the possibility of maintaining this. The phrase ἐν πᾶσι ἀγαθοῖς, if wider,<sup>4</sup> is certainly inclusive of material contribution<sup>5</sup> and moreover, serves to present the matter from

---

reter's Bible, ed. Nolan B. Harmon (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1954), p. 590. He holds that the phrase "is literally 'share in' or 'participation in' their needs." Also Hauch, p. 808, "Das lebendige Anteilnehmen an den Nöten der Heiligen."

<sup>1</sup>Barrett, p. 240.

<sup>2</sup>Ernest De Witt Burton, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, The International Critical Commentary (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1920), p. 336.

<sup>3</sup>The last two are quoted above on p. 37.

<sup>4</sup>R. T. Stamm, The Epistle to the Galatians, in Vol. X, The Interpreter's Bible, ed. Nolan B. Harmon (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1953), p. 578, holding to the transitive force insists "that there is no warrant here or elsewhere in Paul's letters to restrict the connotation of 'in all good things' to material things."

<sup>5</sup>Heinrich Schlier, Der Brief an die Galater, Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1951), p. 203.

a highly spiritual standpoint."<sup>1</sup> It is difficult to limit the grammatical force of the phrase to that of associative dative.<sup>2</sup> Most certainly involved, however, is the thought that the sharing of material benefits is rooted in the sharing of spiritual things.

Philippians 4:15, οὐδεμίᾳ μοι ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐκοινῶνῃσιν εἰς λόγον δόσεως καὶ λήψεως εἰ μὴ ὑμεῖς μόνος, the last of the Pauline uses of koinoneo to be considered, is quite normal. The dative of the person is expressed by μοι and the function of the genitive of the thing shared is filled by the prepositional phrase beginning with εἰς.<sup>3</sup> Paul and the Philippians share or have become partners in "giving and receiving." The thought context is that of Philippians 1:7 and 4:14 which has been discussed above.<sup>4</sup> To classify this as do Arndt and Gingrich<sup>5</sup> among those instances which indicate "to give a share" is quite inadequate, for that force is expressed primarily by δόσεως, not by ἐκοινῶνῃσιν. Such is the thought, but not the grammatical usage.

<sup>1</sup>George S. Duncan, The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, The Moffatt New Testament Commentary (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1934), p. 185. He adds: "Christian giving, for Paul, is never a mere payment, but is an essentially spiritual act in which it is a privilege to be allowed to share (cf. 2 Cor. viii. 1-6), one way among many in which Christians can show their fellowship in the gospel (cf. Phil. i. 5)."

<sup>2</sup>Seesemann, p. 25.

<sup>3</sup>Plato Republica V 453 A: πότερος συγκατὰ φύσιν ἢ ἀνθρωπίνῃ ἢ θήλειᾳ τῇ τοῦ ἀρρενὸς γένους κοινῶνῃσιν εἰς ἅπαντα τὰ ἔργα.

<sup>4</sup>See above pp. 35-36 and 39-40.

<sup>5</sup>Arndt and Gingrich, p. 439. Also Bauer, p. 795 and Hauch, pp. 808f.

Koinonia.--II Corinthians 9:13, διὰ τῆς δοκιμῆς τῆς  
 διακορίας ταύτης δοξάζοντες τὸν θεὸν ἐπὶ τῇ ὑπο-  
 ταγῇ τῆς ὁμολογίας ὑμῶν εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ  
 χριστοῦ καὶ ἀπλότῃ τῆς κοινωίας εἰς αὐτοὺς καὶ εἰς πάντας  
 Seesemann's suggestion of "Mittheilsamkeit"<sup>1</sup> or "communicativeness"<sup>2</sup> as  
 a rendering of koinonia solves the difficulties which are posed by other  
 translations. For if koinonia is taken as concrete "contribution,"<sup>3</sup>  
 καὶ εἰς πάντας becomes a problem; likewise the unnatural use of  
 the preposition εἰς makes Windisch's otherwise appealing "Aufrichti-  
 gkeit eurer Gemeinschaft mit ihnen und mit allem"<sup>4</sup> very difficult. This  
 sense for koinonia, as has been observed in the previous chapter,<sup>5</sup> is  
 derived from the transitive meaning of koinoneo "to give a share" in  
 the sense of "the habitual practice of an activity."<sup>6</sup> Though infrequent  
 and late, this force for koinonia can be paralleled.<sup>7</sup> The most pertinent  
 one for II Corinthians 9:3 is Gnomologium Epicteteum Stobaei 43:  
 χρηστότητι κοινωίας.<sup>8</sup> Thus koinonia designates their dis-

<sup>1</sup>Seesemann, pp. 18f. See above p. 24f.

<sup>2</sup>George, p. 170 suggests "generosity" as the English equivalent.

<sup>3</sup>Plummer, p. 267.

<sup>4</sup>Hans Windisch, Der zweite Korintherbrief, Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament (9th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1924), p. 285.

<sup>5</sup>Above pp. 12f.

<sup>6</sup>"die gewohnte Ausübung einer Thätigkeit." Kuhner-Blass, op. cit., I, II, 260, This use of koinoneo occurs in the New Testament probably at Gal. 6:6 and possibly at Rom. 12:13.

<sup>7</sup>See above p. 25. Philo De Virtutibus 80 and 84 are considered examples of this by Hauck, p. 804.

<sup>8</sup>The full quotation is found on p. 25 above. Hauck, p. 809,



position εἰς αὐτοὺς καὶ εἰς πάντας which lay behind their participation in the offering (9:1).<sup>1</sup> This exceptional use of koinonia can be accounted for by the fact that Paul, being unsure in chapters eight and nine of the readiness of the Corinthians to take part in the offering, was seeking for other than obvious and colourless designations for the collection. He sought to apply to it expressions which would forcefully communicate its inner spiritual character; for example, χάρις (8:4, 6, 7), ἀπλοότης (8:2; 9:11, 13), εὐλογία (9:5), διακονία (8:4; 9:1, 12, 13), λειτουργία (9:12), ὑποταγή τῆς δημολογίας (9:13) as well as koinonia (II Cor. 8:4; cf. Rom. 15:26-27). It is already obvious that the koinonia language has its own contribution to make to Paul's conception of the offering for the Jerusalem Christians in need.

The same general context of thought governs the use of koinonia in Romans 15:26, ἡὐδόκησαν γὰρ Μακεδονία καὶ Ἀχαΐα κοινωρίαν τινὰ ποιήσασθαι εἰς τοὺς πτωχοὺς τῶν ἁγίων τῶν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ. Though no support can be garnered for koinonia in the concrete sense of contribution,<sup>2</sup> Paul seems to have made the abstract "communicativeness" concrete by the aid of τινὰ, for

---

Bauer, p. 795 and Arndt and Gingrich, p. 440 all cite this parallel and accept Seesemann's interpretation. W. G. Kümmel in his revised edition of Hans Lietzmann's commentary on Corinthians, p. 207 adds a note to bring the commentary into harmony with Seesemann's researches at this point. Wendland, p. 98 translates "freigebigen Mitteilbarkeit." But cf. the RSV, "the generosity of your contribution."

<sup>1</sup>George, p. 170, notes "that the meaning here is not reached by way of the idea of 'sharing in contribution' or 'contribution in which we share'."

<sup>2</sup>See the discussion above pp. 24 f.

ποιήσασθαι requires a concrete object. It is then the phrase κοινωρίαν τιρά which designates the collection itself, not just koinonia.<sup>1</sup> This seemingly unique use is thus not as irregular as it might seem. In Paul's mind as he called the more usually termed διακονία (Rom. 15:31; II Cor. 8:4; 9:12, 13. Cf. Rom. 15:25 and II Cor. 8:20 for the verb in the same context)<sup>2</sup> a κοινωρίαν τιρά certainly lay the mutual sharing in the Gospel which is designated by τοῖς πνευματικοῖς αὐτῶν ἐκοινωρήσαν in the following verse.<sup>3</sup> The two are inseparably connected as the remainder of the verse indicates (ὁφείλουσιν καὶ ἐν ταῖς σαρκικαῖς λειτουργηῇσαι αὐτοῖς).

A third employment of koinonia is II Corinthians 8:4 where the churches of Macedonia are characterized as μετὰ πολλῆς πειρασ- κλήσεως δεόμενοι ἡμῶν τὴν χάριν καὶ τὴν κοινωρίαν τῆς διακονίας τῆς εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους. The presence of the genitive makes it unlikely that one can posit the same force for koinonia as in 9:13 and Romans 15:26 above; rather the idea of "participation in" must underlie the usage here.<sup>4</sup> The proximity of χάρις to κοινωρία (χάριν καὶ κοινωρίαν) in what is most probably

<sup>1</sup>Seesemann, p. 29: "Das τιρά = 'eine Art von' weist noch besonders darauf hin, dass eine Umschreibung vorliegt. Ich möchte daher den ganzen Ausdruck κοινωρίαν τιρά, wortlich = 'eine Art von Mitteilbarkeit', mit 'Kollekte' wiedergeben." The RSV translators, perhaps following the misleading entry in Arndt and Gingrich, ignored this point in their "some contribution."

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Acts 11:29.

<sup>3</sup>See above pp. 38f.

<sup>4</sup>Campbell, p. 373.

a hendiadys<sup>1</sup> is most significant. Although "favour"<sup>2</sup> (cf. Acts 24:27; 25:3) is the first sense of χάρις in verse four, it is hardly neutral and separable from its surrounding uses by Paul in verses one (τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ τῇν δεδομένην ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Μακεδονίας) and six (τῇν χάριν ταύτην).<sup>3</sup> Thus one must not only keep in mind the horizontal relationship implied in Paul's employment of koinonia,<sup>4</sup> but also note that Paul can give it a decided religious accent.<sup>5</sup> This use of koinonia in reciting the example of the Macedonian Churches is certainly part of the background of koinonia in its occurrence in 9:13 where Paul is referring directly to the Corinthians' expected participation in this same χάρις.<sup>6</sup>

In I Corinthians 10:14-22 Paul employs koinonia in connection with the elements of the Lord's Supper: τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας ὃ εὐλογοῦμεν, οὐχὶ κοινωνία ἐστὶν τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ

<sup>1</sup>With Windisch, p. 246, Lietzmann, p. 133 and Seesemann, p. 68. Plummer, p. 236, considers the καὶ as "probably epexegetic."

<sup>2</sup>"Privilege" may be a better rendering of this sense of χάρις.

<sup>3</sup>It seems quite probable that the use of χάρις in verse four furnishes the transition between its uses in verses one and six.

<sup>4</sup>"den . . . Sinn . . . der Gemeinschaft und Verbundenheit am Dienst gegenüber den Heiligen" according to Hauck, p. 809. See above p. 17. Koinonia in the exclusive sense of participation is quite infrequent. See the conclusion to Chapter I, above p. 27.

<sup>5</sup>Here Seesemann, p. 68 first makes his claim that for Paul "κοινωνία muss . . . einen tieferen, innerlicheren, religiösen Klang gehabt haben." As to the question of translation he remarks: "Am ehesten passt 'Gemeinschaft' = 'innigste Anteilnahme', jedoch mit religiösem Akzent."

<sup>6</sup>See above p. 45.



Χριστοῦ; τὸν ἄρτον ὃν κλῶμεν, οὐχὶ κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐστίν; . Similarly he uses koinonos to allude to the worship of Israel (οὐχ οἱ ἐσθιόντες τὰς θυσίας κοινοῦ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου εἰσίν;) and to that of the pagans (οὐ θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς κοινωνοὺς τῶν δαιμονίων γίνεσθαι ). The context is a warning against idolatry (φεύγετε ἀπὸ τῆς εἰδωλολατρίας ) based on the nature of the Lord's Supper for it is not Paul's prime purpose to explain the latter by external analogy.<sup>1</sup> His thought moves in the opposite direction.

Thus the distinctively Pauline phrases κοινωνία ἐστίν τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ and κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐστίν call for first attention. As has been demonstrated in the foregoing chapter, koinonia, when it is constructed with the genitive, usually has the normal genitive of the thing shared<sup>2</sup> designating the fundamental sense of participation in something with someone. And since blood and body are grammatically things, priority must be given to this possibility in any inquiry into the manner and content of Paul's thought in this passage.

The acquaintance of Paul with the tradition of the Lord's Supper

<sup>1</sup>Günther Bornkamm, "herrenmahl und Kirche bei Paulus," Studien zu Antike und Urchristentum, Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie, Band 28 (München: Ch. Kaiser Verlag, 1959), p. 138, referring to 10:14-22 writes that "hier entwickelt Paulus positiv aus Wesen und Bedeutung des Abendmahles die Unvereinbarkeit einer Teilnahme an Herrenmahl und Götzenopfermahlen." Cf. Albert Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, trans. William Montgomery (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1931), p. 269, and Lietzmann, p. 48. Hauch, p. 805, appears to proceed in reverse manner.

<sup>2</sup>See above pp. 21-23 for the rare exceptions.

(11:23ff.) requires both that his use of  $\alpha\iota\mu\alpha$  and  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$  in 10:16 must be considered in the light of the whole tradition rooting in the original words of Jesus, and that the two eucharistic phrases cannot be arbitrarily separated in their primary reference.<sup>1</sup> At the same time, however, Paul's utilization of the koinonia language, his reversing of the order of the elements and the comment of verse seventeen would suggest an interpretative element in this employment of the Lord's Supper in his larger argument.<sup>2</sup> But the basic point of departure is that Paul's grasp of the traditional significance of this "twofold parable"<sup>3</sup> of Jesus is fundamental to his immediate use of them.

It follows then that by blood Paul does not refer to the essence of life (Lev. 17:11) as such,<sup>4</sup> but to blood (life) poured out in

<sup>1</sup>Karl Stürmer, "Das Abendmahl bei Paulus," Evangelische Theologie (July-August, 1947), p. 51. Bornkamm, p. 162.

<sup>2</sup>Ernst Käsemann, "Anliegen und Eigenart der paulinischen Abendmahlslehre," Evangelische Theologie (March-April, 1948), pp. 264 and 273. Eduard Schweizer, "Abendmahl: I. Im Nt," Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, ed. Kurt Galling (3rd revised ed.; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr Paul Siebeck, 1957), I, 11. Bornkamm, op. cit., p. 157.

<sup>3</sup>Joachim Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, trans. A. Ehrhardt from the 2nd German edition (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), p. 145. Recent discussions in this area include A. J. B. Higgins, The Lord's Supper in the New Testament, Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 6 (London: S. C. M. Press, 1952), Neville Clark, An Approach to the Theology of the Sacraments, Studies in Biblical Theology No. 17 (London: S. C. M. Press, 1956), Eduard Schweizer, "Abendmahl: I. Im NT," Karl George Kuhn, "The Lord's Supper and the Communal Meal at Qumran," The Scrolls and the New Testament ed. Krister Stendahl (London: S. C. M. Press, 1958), pp. 65-93, and Joh. Steinbeck, "Das Abendmahl Jesu unter Berücksichtigung moderner Forschung," Novum Testamentum (January 1959), pp. 70-79.

<sup>4</sup>As Seesemann, p. 39 insists: "so muss unter dem  $\alpha\iota\mu\alpha$  das Blut als 'Lebenstoff' verstanden werden." This is directly conditioned by the meaning he ascribes to  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ . See below p. 53.

sacrifice indicating the death of Jesus (ὅσακις γὰρ ἔαρ . . .  
 τὸ ποτήριον πίνετε, τὸν θάνατον τοῦ κυρίου κατὰ γ-  
 γέλλετε 11:26)<sup>1</sup> as the foundation and seal of the new Covenant (τοῦτο  
 τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι  
 (11:25)).<sup>2</sup> Thus as Paul linked τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας to  
 τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ χριστοῦ in I Corinthians 10:16 he certainly  
 had nothing less in mind than the effective presence (ἀραμύσειν)<sup>3</sup> of  
 that which was established by and rooted in the death of Jesus. In the  
 words of Behm, "die καινὴ διαθήκη ist ein Korrelat-begriff zur  
 Βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ."<sup>4</sup>

Paul's use of σῶμα is similarly orientated. Jeremias<sup>5</sup> re-

<sup>1</sup>Johannes Behm, "αἷμα," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. Gerhard Kittel (Stuttgart: Verlag von W. Kohlhammer, 1933), I, 173: "Das Interesse des NT haftet nicht an dem Blute Christi als Stoff, sondern an seinem vergossenen Blut, dem ihm gewaltsam genommenen Leben; Blut Christi ist wie Kreuz nur ein anderer, anschaulicher Ausdruck für den Tod Christi in seiner Heilsdeutung."

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Ex. 24:8, Jer. 31:31ff. and 2 Cor. 3:6. Johannes Behm, "διαθήκη," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. Gerhard Kittel (Stuttgart: Verlag von W. Kohlhammer, 1935), II, 137, posits: "Vom dem διαθήκη Wort Jesu aus wird erst voll verstandlich, wie Paulus und Hb dazu gekommen sind, den Begriff διαθήκη in den Mittelpunkt ihrer theologischen Geschichtsbetrachtung zu stellen." But cf. Higgins, pp. 29-34 who doubts that the covenant saying can be traced back to Jesus' own words at the Supper, though he admits that the idea could well have been present in his mind. But apart from this question, the covenant concept is basic to Paul's thought (Rom. 9:4; 11:27; 2 Cor. 3:6ff.; 4:24ff.; Eph. 2:12).

<sup>3</sup>Alan Richardson, An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament (S. C. M. Press Ltd., 1958), pp. 368f.

<sup>4</sup>Behm, "διαθήκη," p. 137. Bornkamm, p. 162 writes: "Neue Bund, d. h. die neue, eschatologische Heilsordnung, der Sache nach: die Herrschaft des erhöhten Christus, die in seinem Tode begründet ist."

<sup>5</sup>Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words, pp. 140f.





search has demonstrated the possibility that bisra (flesh) rather than guph (the whole person) as postulated by Dalman<sup>1</sup> was the most probable Aramaic equivalent of σῶμα on the lips of Jesus. Bisri and ldhmi (blood) are used of the two component parts of the body of a sacrificial victim; thus Jesus in the eucharistic words is speaking of himself as a sacrifice.<sup>2</sup> If this is the foundation of the tradition, then σῶμα as well as αἷμα is grounded in the death of Jesus in the context of the Lord's Supper. But even apart from this specific context Paul can speak in this manner of the body of Christ; for example in Romans 7:4, ὑμεῖς ἑθαροτάθητε τῷ νόμῳ διὰ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ,<sup>3</sup> and Colossians 1:22, νυτὶ δὲ ἀποκατήλλαξεν ἑν τῷ σώματι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου. This is likewise the obvious sense of the Pauline repeated tradition of I Corinthians 11:24, τοῦτο μὲν ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, as τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν indicates.<sup>4</sup> It must be kept in mind that the sacrificial death of Christ designated by body and blood is to be viewed not just as a death, but in line with the Biblical conception of sacrifice<sup>5</sup> as a death

<sup>1</sup>Gustaf Dalman, Jesus-Jeshua, Fr. Paul P. Lefertoff (London: S. P. C. K., 1929), p. 143.

<sup>2</sup>Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words, p. 144.

<sup>3</sup>The analogous ἐὰν δὲ ἀποθάνῃ ὁ ἀνὴρ of verse three demands this sense. But cf. J. A. T. Robinson, The Body (London: S. C. M. Press, 1952), p. 47, who includes also the mystical body.

<sup>4</sup>Wendland, p. 85: "'Für euch' deutet den Tod Jesus als Sühnopfer für die Sünden." Cf. I Cor. 15:3; Rom. 5:6, 8; Gal. 3:13; II Cor. 5:21. This phrase, untranslatable into Aramaic, absent from Mark's account and similar to the Lukan τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον (22:19) is most probably a variant of an original tradition. Cf. Higgins, p. 29.

<sup>5</sup>Vincent Taylor, Jesus and His Sacrifice (London: Macmillan and

T/ v/

ἐὰν

which results in the releasing of a reconciling life.<sup>1</sup>

The problem remains as to how far I Corinthians 10:16 reflects this use of *σῶμα* by Paul. Seesemann with the Aramaic *gūph* in mind, shifts the emphasis to the exalted Lord saying that for Paul "der geschichtliche Herr immer zugleich der Erhöhte ist."<sup>2</sup> He reasons that as the Lord as an earthly personality had a *σῶμα τῆς σαρκός* (Col. 1:22), likewise as the exalted Lord he has a *σῶμα τῆς δόξης* (Phil. 3:21). The body remains the same (dasselbe). Hence Paul can attach the historical Lord to the *σῶμα* and yet have the exalted Lord in view.<sup>3</sup> The presence of the exalted Lord at his table in the redemptive power resulting from his death and resurrection is certainly not to be denied,<sup>4</sup> but that Paul used *σῶμα* at this point to refer directly to the person of the exalted Lord in this manner is another question. *Σῶμα* can and does refer to the person as such in Paul,<sup>5</sup> but here the phrase must be kept parallel in meaning to *αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ* according to the analogy of 11:23 as even Seesemann recognizes<sup>6</sup> though with different

Co., Ltd., 1937-1955), pp. 49-75.

<sup>1</sup>W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism (London: S. P. C. K., 1948), pp. 232-242.

<sup>2</sup>Seesemann, p. 38.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

<sup>4</sup>Eduard Schweizer, p. 10, in a summary article on the Lord's Supper in the New Testament says that three theological motives are operative in the four accounts. One he states as "eine neue Bekräftigung des Bundes Gottes mit seiner Gemeinde. In ihm tritt ja die Gemeinde in Tischgemeinschaft mit ihrem erhöhten Herrn."

<sup>5</sup>J. A. T. Robinson, The Body, p. 29.

<sup>6</sup>Seesemann, p. 39.

results. It is not just the earthly historical body which is primary, but that body given freely in death now viewed from the vantage point of its post-Easter consequences, that is, the contemporaneity of the reconciling covenanting death of Christ through the invisible present exalted Lord himself in whom the kingdom of God has arrived.<sup>1</sup>

When the phrases *κοινωνία . . . τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ* and *κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ* are thus approached, the normal force of koinonia with the genitive makes excellent sense. In the drinking of the cup and the eating of the bread at the Lord's Supper Christians are at the same time partakers of the blood and body of the Lord--those salvation realities resident in the resurrected, exalted, yet crucified Lord who is actually present at the table by the Spirit (II Cor. 3:17). This is Christian worship at its ultimate. By his use of koinonia Paul has interpreted the *ἐσθίειν* of the traditional accounts.<sup>2</sup> The end result naturally is in part table fellowship with Christ (vs. 21 *τραπέσης κυρίου* ), but that is not what Paul is saying precisely; his thought is on a more central pivot. Likewise Seesemann's emphasis on "Einswerden"<sup>3</sup> and Hauck's on an "innige Verbindung"<sup>4</sup> based on a difference between the koinon- words and the metecho

<sup>1</sup>Stürmer, p. 58. E. Schweizer, p. 19: "Aber wesentlich ist er für ihm ja nur als Bereich der Herrschaft des Kyrios und der Segnungen des Erhöhten, in denen er als der Gekreuzigte für seiner Gemeinde gegenwärtig wird."

<sup>2</sup>Käsemann, p. 278: "Denn wie immer der Sinn des so lang und hart umkämpften *ἐσθίειν* bei den Synoptikern bestimmt werden mag, bei Paulus liegt hier kein Problem vor, insofern der Apostel dieses *ἐσθίειν* in 10, 16ff. durch den *κοινωνία* -Begriff selber interpretiert hat."

<sup>3</sup>Seesemann, p. 44.

<sup>4</sup>Hauck, p. 806.



(vss. 17 and 21) group and supported by Chrysostom<sup>1</sup> should not be carried too far here.<sup>2</sup> For even though the koinon-- words are more suited to describe something inward,<sup>3</sup> Paul has employed the genitive rather than the dative. This sense here would be better looked for in another direction (cf. vs. 17). The first force then of koinonia in this verse, as indicated by the genitive construction, is a participation directed ultimately to Christ via the connotatively rich τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ χριστοῦ and τοῦ σώματος τοῦ χριστοῦ.<sup>4</sup>

Verse seventeen, ὅτι εἰς ἄρτος, ἐν σῶμα οἱ πολλοὶ ἔσμεν· οἱ γὰρ πάντες ἐκ τοῦ ἑνὸς ἄρτου μετέχουμεν, which has been on the one hand considered as a parenthetical digression of the main thought of the passage<sup>5</sup> and on the other as requiring σώματος τοῦ χριστοῦ in verse sixteen to be taken in the specifically

<sup>1</sup>Johannes Chrysostom, "Homiliae XLIV in Epistolam primam ad Corinthios," Patrologiae Graecae, ed. J. P. Migne (1860), LXI, Homily XXIV, p. 200 ὁ ἄρτος, οὐ κλῶμεν, οὐχὶ κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ χριστοῦ ἐστὶ; διὰ τί μὴ εἶπε, μετοχή; ὅτι πλεονεξία δὲ δηλώσαι ἡ βουλήθη, καὶ πολλὰ ἐρθεῖσθαι τὴν συνάφειαν. οὐ γὰρ τῷ μετέχει μόνον καὶ μεταλαμβάνειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ ἐρθεῖσθαι κοινωνοῦμεν.

<sup>2</sup>Similarly Lietzmann, p. 48: "ein Mittel zur Erlangung der Gemeinschaft" and Arndt and Gingrich's possibility, "a means for attaining a close relationship with the blood (body) of Christ," p. 440.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Seesemann, pp. 3 and 43, L. S. Thornton, The Common Life in the Body of Christ (3rd. ed.; London: Dacre Press, 1950), pp. 44ff., and George, p. 171.

<sup>4</sup>Note that the τρῶς ἐκ τοῦ κυρίου μετέχει of verse 21 is a conceptual parallel to verse 16.

<sup>5</sup>Johannes Weiss, Der erste Korintherbrief, Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament (10th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1925), p. 258, and Ernest Best, One Body in Christ (London: S. P. C. K., 1955), p. 88.

Pauline sense of the Church (cf. Col. 1:18, 24),<sup>1</sup> is actually the crux of the whole argument. It affords the rationale for Paul's employment of the koinonia language, accounts for his reversal of the traditional phrases and is the key by which verse sixteen can unlock the difficult verse which follows. The import of the verse is that Christians, especially (not that they are not otherwise)<sup>2</sup> in their partaking together of the Lord's Supper, though many, constitute one  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ , the  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$  τοῦ  $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$ .<sup>3</sup> They are united to each other because they are common sharers in the body (blood) of Christ. They are a unity in Christ. He shifts the order of the cup and bread because the one loaf and his normal terminological use of  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$  make it convenient to develop his point out of the bread saying. But it is the partaking of both the blood and the body which constitutes their oneness as the body of Christ.<sup>4</sup> Paul's

<sup>1</sup>Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, op. cit., p. 157, Kümmel in Lietzmann, p. 182 and Robinson, The Body, pp. 47, 65 and 74 in his own way.

<sup>2</sup>Eduard Schweizer, p. 11: "Natürlich ist die Gemeinde auch ausserhalb der Herrenmahlfeier der Leib Christi; aber Paulus braucht den Ausdruck in Zusammenhang mit der Gottesdienstgemeinde, weil er nur dort konkret in Erscheinung tritt."

<sup>3</sup>This is not to identify the two uses of  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ . Cf. Bornkamm, p. 164. For Paul's use of  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$  to designate the Church cf. especially the recent studies of Robinson, The Body, and Ernest Best, One Body in Christ (London: S. P. C. K., 1955). G. J. C. Marchant, "The Body of Christ," The Evangelical Quarterly (January-March, 1958), pp. 3-17, discusses the two concluding that "the 'body of Christ' in the sense of the Church is a metaphor expressing spiritual experience which is real, unity with Christ and His people which is actual, but not in the actuality of His body glorified with theirs of flesh, but in the participation and fellowship of the Holy Spirit," p. 17.

<sup>4</sup>Bornkamm, p. 162, aptly points out that "deutlich ist hier, dass das  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$  -Wort von 11 24 und nur dieses für Paulus die Basis abgibt für die Formulierung des ekklesiologischen Satzes 10 17." It is quite possible that the origin of Paul's concept of the Church as the body of Christ lay in his reflec-

logic is realistic as he connects the two verses. The presenting of this oneness at the table in its foundation in their common participation is Paul's purpose in verses sixteen and seventeen.

This points back to the koinonia language in verse sixteen. It has been shown that Paschal ideas dominate Paul's view of the Eucharist and for that matter the whole tradition even apart from the identity of the Last Supper with a passover meal.<sup>1</sup> This fact, according to Davies, suggests that the ideal of community plays a large part in Paul's thought concerning the Lord's Supper. He writes that

just as in the Jewish Passover we have a memorial festival of thanksgiving for a past event that had led to the formation of the community of the old Israel so for Paul the death of Jesus, when he thinks of the Eucharist, is primarily the means whereby the New community is constituted. . . . In the above passages the idea of community, is, therefore, central and in the immediate context of the Pauline account of the Last Supper it is the need of a proper awareness of the New Community to which Christ had given birth that makes it necessary for Paul to discuss the Supper at all.<sup>2</sup>

Koinonia rooted in the idea of a sharing in common is used by Paul in connection with the blood<sup>3</sup> and body of the Lord to pave the way for the

---

tion on the language and meaning of the Lord's Supper. Cf. A. E. J. Rawlinson, "Corpus Christi," Mysterium Christi, ed. G. K. A. Bell and Adolf Deissmann (London: Longman's, Green and Co., 1930), p. 227, Higgins, pp. 69f., Best, p. 87 and Clark, p. 67.

<sup>1</sup>Theo Preiss, "Was the Last Supper a Paschal Meal?", Life in Christ, Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 13 (London: S. C. M. Press, 1954), pp. 81-100. W. D. Davies, pp. 250ff. Cf. Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, Higgins, pp. 15-23 and Clark, An Approach to the Theology of the Sacraments.

<sup>2</sup>Davies, pp. 352f. Cf. R. P. Shedd, Man in Community: A Study of St. Paul's Application of Old Testament and Early Jewish Conceptions of Human Solidarity (London: The Epworth Press, 1953), pp. 189-193.

<sup>3</sup>Steinbeck, p. 77, who grounds the blood word directly in the old covenant at Sinai points out the common idea even there: "Die gemeinsame Teilnahme an demselben Blut kittete beide Blutemp-



conclusion of verse seventeen. It is the common sharing of the body and blood which makes it possible for him to say  $\epsilon\tilde{\nu}$  σῶμα οἱ πολλοὶ  $\epsilon\tilde{\sigma}\mu\epsilon\tilde{\nu}$  which he further emphasizes by οἱ γὰρ πάντες ἐκ τοῦ  $\epsilon\tilde{\nu}\sigma\tilde{\omega}\mu\alpha$  μετέχομεν. The primary point is that οἱ πολλοὶ are thereby  $\epsilon\tilde{\nu}\sigma\tilde{\omega}\mu\alpha$  and that in or of Christ, which fact furnishes the platform for the rest of the argument, accounts for Paul's shift of the eucharistic phrase and his use of koinonia, for the latter with its double dimension was uniquely fitted for his purposes.

As he utilizes his koinonia-logic against idolatry, Paul pauses to illustrate his point in the current worship of Israel,<sup>1</sup> βλέπετε τὸν Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ σάρκα· οὐχ οἱ ἐσθίουσιν τὰς θυσίας κοινῶς τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου εἰσίν ; In line with the paschal character of this section of I Corinthians the reference is most probably to the Passover celebration "when a covenant sacrifice was followed by a covenant meal."<sup>2</sup> The problematic θυσιαστηρίου<sup>3</sup> represents

fanger, sei es Mensch und Mensch, sei es Gott und Mensch, auf das festeste zusammen."

<sup>1</sup>The present tense, εἰσίν, excludes a reference here to the offering to the golden calf of Ex. 32:5, 6, as for example Bornkamm, p. 138.

<sup>2</sup>James Moffatt, The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, The Moffatt New Testament Commentary (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1938, p. 136. Because of its lack of general religious significance, the custom of the eating of the temple sacrifices by the Levites alluded to by Paul in 9:13 is hardly in his mind here. The similar use of koinonos in Philo De Specialibus Legibus I 331 and 221 usually cited does not alter the situation. Dt. 12 would afford a closer parallel.

<sup>3</sup>θυσιαστηρίου as strictly a metonym for God as adduced by Von Hugo Gressmann, "Ἡ Κοινωνία τῶν Σαίμωνος," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft (1921), pp. 224-230, and followed by Hauck, p. 805, and Seesemann, p. 52, is both improbable and unnecessary. Cf. Jourdan, p. 123, and Campbell, p. 376.

the historical, redemptive and covenantal reality bound up in the celebration, that is, it is to Israel what the Lord's table is to the Christian community.<sup>1</sup> There is a parallelism of relationship. One is no more a metonym than the other, yet both refer beyond themselves. Those who join together in the eating of the meal thereby constitute themselves "partners of the altar", that is, participators in the worship of Israel's God. "Partners in the worship of God" would be nearer the force of the phrase rather than either "partners with God" or "participators in God."<sup>2</sup>

The normal genitive reveals the stress of Paul in this instance that joining oneself on a horizontal plane with an acting group involves one vertically in participation or partnership in that which is the basis of the unity or the purpose of the formation of that group. In one sense Paul's thought is now proceeding in reverse manner. In the case of the Lord's Supper a vertical participation implies a horizontal unity, here a horizontal unity incorporates a vertical participation.

Coming now to the main point of the whole paragraph and the meaning of *κοινωνοὺς τῆς θείας ἑστίας*, Paul applies the above illustrated principle to point out the implications of joining in the eating of pagan sacrifices. For grammatical purposes *κοινωνοὺς τῆς θείας ἑστίας* can be considered the normal genitive of the thing as in

<sup>1</sup>Jean Héring, La Première Épître De Saint Paul aux Corinthiens in Vol. VII of Commentaire Du Nouveau Testament (Neuchâtel and Paris: Delachaux and Niestlé S. A., 1949), p. 86, comments that "Θυσιαστήριον préfigure la table de communion."

<sup>2</sup>Here it can be pointed out that the LXX and the Hebrew Old Testament avoid the use of the *koinon-* and *7 2 77* words respectively to express the relationship between man and God. Hauck, p. 802. Philo, however, did. Cf. De Vita Mosis I 158.

verses sixteen and eighteen meaning literally "partners in demons."<sup>1</sup> Paul is arguing that to associate with pagans in their cult meals is to participate with them in demon worship--in the recognition of supernatural powers opposed to God.<sup>2</sup> Thus one becomes involved in that which is a direct contradiction of and in blatant opposition to the gracious reality resident in the observance of the Lord's Supper. Therefore his conclusion: "You cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of the demons. You cannot partake (*μετέχειν*) of the table of the Lord and the table of demons. Shall we provoke the Lord to jealousy? Are we stronger than he?" Paul has interpreted the significance of the pagan cult meal in the light of the nature of the Lord's Supper. The recognition of this flow of the argument shows that great care must be exercised in any attempt to use pagan terminological analogies to assess Paul's views of the Lord's Supper in this passage.<sup>3</sup> They are to a great extent beside the point.

Paul in I Corinthians 10:14-22 has utilized the koinonia language with its unique capacity for double-dimensional reference to construct a very potent argument against participation in pagan cult meals. At the same time his application of this language to the Lord's Supper affords insight into his conception of its character.

Closely related to Paul's use of koinonia in I Corinthians 10:16

---

<sup>1</sup>Campbell, p. 393. *τὸ δαιμόνιον* is neuter.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Deut. 32:17 which is reflected in verse 20 and also I Cor. 8. There is no necessity at this point to delve into the problems involved in the comparison of these passages in their relation to Paul's conception of the demonic powers.

<sup>3</sup>A good listing of these parallels is that of Lietzmann, pp. 49-50. Cf. Seesemann, p. 102.



is I Corinthians 1:9, *ἡμεῖς δὲ θεοῦ, δι' οὗ ἐκλήθητε εἰς κοινωνίαν τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν*. Here, however, the genitive is used to refer directly to Christ rather than to his body and blood. It is at least at first sight a clear case of the genitive of the person which is quite rare with koinonia,<sup>1</sup> occurring only here in the New Testament.<sup>2</sup> A possible subjective genitive, either Jourdan's<sup>3</sup> "the sharing-together effected by his Son" or the more concrete interpretation "the Fellowship created by his Son" championed by C. A. Scott,<sup>4</sup> is hardly plausible due to the lack of the definite article. The rendering "fellowship with his Son"<sup>5</sup> as the literal meaning involves an objective genitive in the role of the associative dative which is an exceedingly rare construction.<sup>6</sup> This sense as the dominating idea is at best unlikely. A third possibility is to keep the genitive objective and allow koinonia the force it normally has with the genitive, that primarily of participation. One can either with Campbell consider this a normal genitive of the thing even

<sup>1</sup>Seesemann, pp. 15f., and Hauck, p. 799. See above p. 21 and pp. 8-9 where its occurrence in the LXX is noted. Cf. Mt. 23:30 and Heb. 10:33.

<sup>2</sup>*τινέου α* which occurs in the genitive with koinonia in II Cor. 13:13 and Phil. 2:1 is grammatically neutral, whatever Paul may have considered the Holy Spirit theologically.

<sup>3</sup>Jourdan, p. 118. Since his position here is the application of his interpretation of Phil. 2:1 and especially II Cor. 13:13, it is more fully discussed below p. 67.

<sup>4</sup>C. Anderson Scott, "What Happened at Pentecost," The Spirit, ed. B. H. Streeter (London: Macmillan, 1919), pp. 138f.

<sup>5</sup>Arndt and Gingrich, p. 439.

<sup>6</sup>See above p. 21.

though a person is involved,<sup>1</sup> or with Seesemann as a genuine genitive of the person in which koinonia retains its basic meaning over against the more frequent occurrence of this construction in contexts in which it has acquired a special significance.<sup>2</sup> Of course one cannot rule out the possibility of koinonia having acquired a special significance for Paul in certain contexts!

This third possibility as the interpretive starting point has more to commend it than the improbability of the first two alternatives. The similarity to 10:16 as well as the immediate context (vss. 4-9) in which Paul is giving thanks to God for the Corinthians on the basis of (ἐπὶ) τῇ χάριτι τοῦ Θεοῦ τῇ δοθείσῃ ἡμῖν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ suggests that Paul had in mind not just the person of the Lord as such, but the total salvation reality resident and manifest in him. As Lightfoot put it, "the κοινωνία τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ is co-extensive in meaning with the βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ."<sup>3</sup> The reference is both present as in 10:16 and future (vss. 7b-8), the former guaranteeing the latter (Phil. 1:6),<sup>4</sup> including the realities designated by the Pauline formulas ἐν Χριστῷ and σὺν Χριστῷ.<sup>5</sup> Seen thus, the normal

<sup>1</sup>Campbell, pp. 358 and 380. He comments that "Paul frequently speaks of the risen and glorified Christ in a curiously impersonal way." Also see above p. 22.

<sup>2</sup>Seesemann, pp. 15-16 and 47-48.

<sup>3</sup>J. B. Lightfoot, Notes on the Epistles of St. Paul (London: Macmillan and Co., 1895), p. 150.

<sup>4</sup>Kümmel in Lietzmann, p. 167 writes of "die durch den Glauben erworbene reale Anteilnahme an dem himmlischen Herrn und seinem Heil in der Gegenwart (I 10 16) und die Zugehörigkeit zum Κύριος bei der Parusie."

<sup>5</sup>Seesemann, p. 49; Hauck, p. 805.

force of koinonia is here the most natural and at the same time a significantly rich expression. The fact that the participation so much centers in a person strains the capacity of language (at least translation language) and makes the attempt to distinguish between the genitive of the thing or person quite academic. Never was koinonia applied to such an object! The concept is inclusive rather than exclusive. The idea of fellowship is difficult to avoid here even more than in 10:16, but Thornton's comment "that when the object shared is a person 'fellowship with' or 'communion with' may give the meaning as truly as 'participation in'"<sup>1</sup> tends to lose sight of the necessity of the idea of participation for a full understanding of the expression. Likewise Moffatt is misleading when he speaks of "participation in its pregnant sense of fellowship."<sup>2</sup>

Again it is obvious that Paul is not unaware of the horizontal range of his koinonia language. It is a sharing together and a common participation becomes his grave concern in the section which immediately follows. That proper awareness of the community rooted in the person and work of Christ which is never far from Paul's thoughts in this epistle is first expressed by his use of koinonia in 1:9.

Falling into a similar category are Philippians 2:1 and II Corinthians 13:13. Considering first Philippians 2:1, *Εἰς τὴν κοινωνίαν πνεύματος*, especially if I Corinthians 10:16 and 1:9 have been correctly analysed, there seems little real reason to depart from

---

<sup>1</sup>Thornton, p. 71.

<sup>2</sup>Moffatt, p. 7. His translation, however, reads: "Faithful is the God who called you to participate in his son Jesus our Lord." p. 6.



the results of the recent studies<sup>1</sup> which agree in holding to the normal force of koinonia with the genitive as affording the best interpretation. The genitive would then be objective and the RSV rendering "participation in the Spirit" would be the most precise. The objections brought to bear against the subjective genitive in I Corinthians 1:9 would also be valid here.<sup>2</sup> The views of those who hold to the subjective genitive in making koinonia mean "unity,"<sup>3</sup> which does admirably fit the context (1:27; 2:5), are adequately summarized and handled by Seesemann.<sup>4</sup> While such a concept is definitely Pauline (I Cor. 12:4-11), it is right to ask why, if this was Paul's first meaning, did he not use ἐνότης as in Ephesians 4:3,<sup>5</sup> particularly in the light of the preceding ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι of 1:27? In support of the objective genitive Seesemann points out by the aid of several quotations that the phrase κοινῶν (τοῦ ἁγίου) πνεύματος in the writers of the early church always meant "participation in the Spirit."<sup>6</sup> He also argues that the four expressions in the verse fall into two pairs, the first two referring to something outside man coming near to him, and the latter two designating that which is present in man. To take πνεύματος as genitive of

<sup>1</sup>Seesemann, pp. 56ff., Campbell, p. 378, Hauck, p. 807, Thornton, p. 71, and George, p. 178.

<sup>2</sup>See above p. 61.

<sup>3</sup>Arndt and Gingrich, p. 440, allows a sense very close to this.

<sup>4</sup>Seesemann, pp. 58-60.

<sup>5</sup>ἐνότης, however, is used only in Ephesians, which has been felt by some to be evidence against the Pauline authorship of Ephesians.

<sup>6</sup>Seesemann, pp. 56-57. He quotes Acts Thomae 132 and 139, Origenes, Joh. Komm. VI 22 and Methodius, de resurrectione III 16, 9.

author would thus not fit the context. He goes on to point out that the first phrase of each pair is a religious concept, ἐν Χριστῷ, πνεύματος, and the last phrase an ethical one, ἀγάπης, σπλάγχνα καὶ ὀκτιρμοί. In both Paul names first that which pertains to God and second the one pertaining to man.<sup>1</sup>

Further it should be noted that the grammatically neutral character of πνεῦμα as well as the primarily functional<sup>2</sup> manner of Paul's thought concerning the Holy Spirit<sup>3</sup> pose less difficulties for this interpretation than in I Corinthians 1:9. Since the Holy Spirit is something received<sup>4</sup> it is not strange language to participate in the Spirit. Again one would have to say that there is more involved than fellowship unless that concept is in turn enlarged.<sup>5</sup> Mere fellowship apart from

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 61f.

<sup>2</sup>The German 'heilsgeschichtlich' would be more precise. Cf. Wendland, p. 234.

<sup>3</sup>Neill Q. Hamilton, The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in Paul, Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers No. 6 (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, Ltd., 1957), p. 3, states that "the problem of the Trinity, which is the occasion of the doctrine of the Trinity, was for Paul no problem. He does not discuss it. To deal with the Spirit in the tradition of the New Testament is to avoid all speculation about the nature of the being of the Spirit. The viewpoint of the New Testament is consistently that of a concern with redemptive history, and this redemptive history is for the first Christians a 'Christ-process'." Cf. Oscar Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, tr. Shirley C. Guthrie and Charles A. M. Hall (London: S. C. M. Press, Ltd., 1959), p. 2, and Alan Richardson, pp. 120-124. This is not to exclude any possibility of a personal concept of the Holy Spirit by Paul as Windisch, p. 428, does, but to maintain the supremacy of the "Christ-Process" in the language of Oscar Cullmann, Christ and Time, tr. Floyd V. Filson (London: S. C. M. Press, 1951), p. 21.

<sup>4</sup>Gal. 3:2, ἐξ ἔργων νόμου τὸ πνεῦμα ἔλαβετε ἢ ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως. Cf. also I Th. 4:8.

<sup>5</sup>Hamilton, p. 28, makes fellowship the larger concept (also in

the salvation realities involved in the possession of the Holy Spirit would hardly satisfy the meaning of Paul. Thus "fellowship with the Spirit"<sup>1</sup> can be considered an ambiguous as well as loose translation of *κοινωνία πνεύματος*.

In view of the larger exhortation in which the appeal is found, that to Christian unity and humility (2:1-11), Paul's appeal was "if there be any common-participation in the Spirit." It certainly fits the purpose of his argument to use *koinonia* in its full dual-dimensional sense. The resultant meaning would be in line with the essentially social nature of his view of the Spirit's activity (Eph. 2:18-22; 4:1-6; I Cor. 12:13; 3:16).<sup>2</sup> "Fellowship" of the Philippian Christians understood as rooted in their mutual experience of the Holy Spirit is the import of the phrase. This meaning, however, must come by way of *πνεύματος* as an objective genitive.

In II Corinthians 13:13, *Ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ ἁγίου<sup>3</sup> πνεύματος μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν*, the phrase *κοινωνία τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος* is found in apparent parallelism with two phrases containing genitives which are generally held to be subjective.<sup>4</sup> Because

---

II Cor. 13:13) but limits the idea of participation to the gifts of the Spirit. Likewise Windisch on II Cor. 13:13, p. 428.

<sup>1</sup>Arndt and Gingrich, p. 440 give this as their first choice.

<sup>2</sup>Davies, pp. 201 and 207f.

<sup>3</sup>Omitted by P 46.

<sup>4</sup>C. F. D. Moule, *An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek* (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1959), p. 41, expresses uncertainty about *ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ* being wholly subjective genitive, while Campbell, p. 379, and George, p. 179 point out that *Ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου* cannot be considered as a subjective



of this it is often maintained that the genitive in the third phrase should also be considered subjective. The most common rendering of those who do so is "the fellowship created by the Holy Spirit."<sup>1</sup> But in the first place if Paul was really concerned about grammatical symmetry--a purely arbitrary assumption--"the fellowship created by the Holy Spirit" cannot furnish an exact grammatical parallel to "God loves" and "Christ is gracious to" for there would be no corresponding verb.<sup>2</sup> Campbell further argues that such a translation is grammatically impossible in that "*κοινωνεῖν* cannot mean 'to impart fellowship' but only 'to have fellowship,' and so *κοινωνία* can mean only 'the having of fellowship,' not 'the imparting of fellowship.'"<sup>3</sup>

Jourdan, who holds to the subjective genitive in I Corinthians 1:9 and Philippians 2:1 as well as here, begins with the rare though possible meaning of *koinoneo* "to give a share"<sup>4</sup> and *koinonia* "a share-giving."<sup>5</sup> He then takes the subjective genitive to refer "not to the person with whom, or the thing in which, the sharing-together takes place

genitive in the precise grammatical sense.

<sup>1</sup>This is not 'The Fellowship--Church' of Scott which completely destroys any semblance of parallelism in the phrase. Among those who defend the subjective genitive are Davies, p. 178, and Jean Hering, *La Seconde Épître de Saint Paul aux Corinthiens*, Vol. VIII, *Commentaire du Nouveau Testament* (Neuchâtel and Paris: Delachaux and Niestlé, 1958), p. 105. Thornton, pp. 69f., considers this a legitimate possibility. Plummer, p. 384 renders it "the sense of membership which the Holy Spirit imparts to those who are united in one Body." He admits, however, that the genitive may be objective.

<sup>2</sup>George, p. 179.

<sup>3</sup>Campbell, p. 378.

<sup>4</sup>See above, pp. 12-13.

<sup>5</sup>See above, pp. 24-26.

but rather to the person by whom the sharing is effected."<sup>1</sup> Thus koinonia would be the divine gift of 'sharing-together' corresponding to the χάρις of the Lord Jesus and the ἀγάπη of God.<sup>2</sup> Although this makes an attractive picture, it is open to several objections. Not the least is that it is based upon a rare use of koinonia which has only been found plausible in a limited context.<sup>3</sup> The main objection is that it rejects the normal force of the genitive with koinonia yet at the same time implies that which would otherwise be obvious from the construction, for he concludes that koinonia

possesses a quality of signification which is capable of being applied simultaneously in an internal and in an external direction, that is to say, of being used at the same time with an objective and a subjective force. It can mean, at one and the same time, the "having a share", the "receiving of a share", and the "granting of a share."<sup>4</sup>

That is, it is "the sharing-together in the Holy Spirit" that is granted by the Holy Spirit. And this the objective genitive can express with

<sup>1</sup>Jourdan, p. 118.

<sup>2</sup>Johannes Chrysostom, "Homiliae XXX in Epistolam secundam ad Corinthios," Patrologiae Graecae, ed. J. P. Migne (1860), LXI, Homily XXX, p. 608, οὕτω τὰ τῆς τριάδος ἀδιαίρετα καὶ ὁ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐστὶν ἡ κοινωνία, εἰρηθὴ καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ ὁ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ χάρις, καὶ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος.

to which he appeals, does not necessarily indicate that Chrysostom held all three genitives to be alike subjective, but rather that he held to the unity and identity of the Son, the Father and the Holy Spirit in that where the χάρις, ἀγάπη or κοινωνία of one was, there was also the χάρις, ἀγάπη or κοινωνία respectively of the other two.

<sup>3</sup>See the discussion on Rom. 12:13 and Gal. 6:6 above pp. 42-44 and on II Cor. 9:13 and Rom. 15:26 above pp. 45-47.

<sup>4</sup>Jourdan, p. 119. Seesemann, p. 71 says that he knows no example where "ein genetiv bei einem Substantiv gleichzeitig Gen. obj. und Gen. subj. ist."

less complexity with koinonia than can the subjective construction. Further one need not always equate precise grammatical force with full theological content. In the same vein there is a distinction between the primary function of a word in an expression and its accompanying overtones.

If one posits the more usual objective force of the genitive with koinonia in line with its probability in the similar constructions of I Corinthians 1:9 and Philippians 2:1, a symmetry of thought can be seen in this benedictory prayer which would more likely be the aim of Paul than any artificial grammatical parallelism. If ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος [taken first and foremost as "participation in the Holy Spirit" the Apostle is expressing in another way the identical salvation-reality resident in each of the other two phrases. That which Paul has known as ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ respectively he has also learned to know as ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος.<sup>1</sup> It is a three-in-one desire comprehensively expressed in terms of and arising from the experience and faith of the early Christian Church.<sup>2</sup> The symmetry is in the parallel and progressing impact of each phrase in its totality, not in its inner construction.<sup>3</sup> And as Seesemann<sup>4</sup> points out from II Thessalonians 2:13,

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Rom. 5:5-11. Windisch, p. 428, notes that "wie man die Gnade Christi und die Liebe Gottes erlebt, so gewinnt man auch Anteil am Heiligen Geist."

<sup>2</sup>R. H. Strachan, The Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, The Moffatt New Testament Commentary (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935), pp. 145f. Seesemann, pp. 63ff. Cf. also the excursus in Windisch, pp. 429ff., and Wendland, pp. 233f.

<sup>3</sup>It is not enough to note with Hamilton, p. 27, that the proper parallel members are grace, love, Spirit.

<sup>4</sup>Seesemann, p. 70.



ὅτι ἔλατο ὑμᾶς ὁ θεὸς ἀπαρχὴν εἰς σωτηρίαν ἐν  
 ἁγίᾳ σμῶ πνεύματος καὶ πίστει ἀληθείας, the two types  
 of genitive can and do occur in phrases bound together in parallel fashion. The objection that the third phrase destroys the balance of gift and giver of the first two when the objective genitive is held to is offset by the realization that the genitive of participation in its involvement here with spirit, is indirectly the proof that the Holy Spirit creates and establishes the participation.<sup>1</sup> Therefore the Holy Spirit is here both the gift and the giver, but on a theological rather than a grammatical basis.<sup>2</sup> This in no way necessitates an ambiguous or indistinct genitive which would embrace in itself the two facets. The implications involved in τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος are quite sufficient. It is hard to imagine how Paul could have conceived of a better balance with such sweeping comprehensiveness of thought in a few words. Thus to depart from the objective genitive which is at the same time the normal force of the genitive with koinonia would raise more problems than it would solve. It requires less strained ingenuity, is rich in theological

<sup>1</sup>Wendland, p. 233.

<sup>2</sup>Wendland, p. 234, gives an excellent account of this: "Paulus spricht von dem Wirken des Geistes, der die Gnadengaben oder die Liebe oder die Heiligung hervorruft und gibt (vgl. Röm. 15, 16 u. 30; 2 Thess. 2, 13). Daneben aber ist der Geist das Mittel und die Kraft, durch die Gott sich offenbart und Christus wirksam ist. Christus ist der Herr des Geistes (3, 18 vgl. 3, 17), und Geist ist die Gegenwart des Herrn in den Glaubenden, in seiner Gemeinde. Er kann ebensowohl als personhafte Macht wie (sächlich) als Gabe, Kraft oder Mittel des göttlichen Offenbarungshandelns gefasst werden. Paulus hat sich nicht terminologisch festgelegt. Aber gerade auf diese Weise wird ein wesentlicher, theologischer Sachverhalt sichtbar: dass nämlich in dem Gegebenen der Geber wirksam und gegenwärtig ist. So ist der Geist als der Geist des Herrn zugleich der Geber und die Gabe, so wie die Gnade Christi oder die Liebe Gottes gleichfalls Geber und Gabe zugleich sind, weil Gott sich selber in seiner Liebe

overtones and implications and enhances the grandeur of the total expression.

The very fact that some scholars have been prepared to give the priority to the horizontal dimension would warn against neglecting it even while asserting the primacy of participation. As *μετὰ πάντων συνῶν* indicates, Paul has the Christian Community in mind and thus a word which includes it, even in a secondary manner, is no intruder. That Paul so used koinonia is given further emphasis if Wendland is right in asserting that "der Segenswunsch des Paulus wird den gottesdienstlichen Versammlungen der paulinischen Gemeinden entstammen."<sup>1</sup> The similarity of this use of koinonia with I Corinthians 1:9, 10:16 and Philippians 2:1 is obvious.<sup>2</sup>

In Philippians 1:5, *Εὐχαριστῶ τῷ Θεῷ μου* (verse 3)<sup>3</sup> . . . *ἐπὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ συνῶν εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἡμῶν τῆς πρώτης ἡμέρας ἀρχὴ τοῦ ῥῶν* , it is possible to proceed in either of two directions. First in line with the other Pauline constructions of koinonia with *εἰς* (Rom. 15:26 and II Cor. 9:13)<sup>4</sup> one can think

dahingibt."

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 233.

<sup>2</sup>There is no need to reiterate the arguments against "fellowship with the Holy Spirit," Arndt and Gingrich, p. 440, which have been given above in connection with I Cor. 1:9 and Phil. 2:1.

<sup>3</sup>J. B. Lightfoot, Saint Paul's Epistle to the Philippians (London: Macmillan and Co., 1879), p. 83. Martin Dibelius, An Die Thessalonicher I II An Die Philipper, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament (2nd revised ed.; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1925), p. 53. This direction of thought seems to be indicated by the parallel *ἐκ* 's and the secondary or subservient nature of *πάντοτε . . . ποιοῦμενος*. But cf. Bonnard, p. 16.

<sup>4</sup>See above pp. 45-47.

in terms of "co-operation towards, in aid of the Gospel,"<sup>1</sup> designating with them primarily material aid (4:10-20); yet the meaning need not be so narrow. This would give to koinonia the quite rare sense of communicativeness.<sup>2</sup> Second, the  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  can be held to be a substitute for the genitive allowing the force of the phrase to become "participation in the Gospel" conceived either in terms of its salvation benefits<sup>3</sup> or of its proclamation in an inclusive sense.<sup>4</sup> That it is possible for the same general meaning to be obtained from either interpretation of  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  is significant. Two main questions, the nature of  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  and the content of  $\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\iota\omicron\nu$ , must be considered before Paul's use of koinonia in this passage can be determined. To these can be added a third--the horizontal implications of the expression.

The possibility of  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  serving as a genitive substitute with koinonia is indisputable, for such can be demonstrated for koinonos<sup>5</sup> and koinoneo<sup>6</sup> and also possibly for koinonia itself.<sup>7</sup> If such a use is posited in Philippians 1:5 the occasion for it can be seen in the presence in the phrase of another genitive, which to avoid ambiguity would

<sup>1</sup>Lightfoot, Saint Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, p. 83.

<sup>2</sup>See above p. 24

<sup>3</sup>Seesemann, p. 79: "κοινωνία εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ist also Umschreibung für 'Glauben'."

<sup>4</sup>Bonnard, p. 16.

<sup>5</sup>Plato Respublica I, 333 B.

<sup>6</sup>Plato Respublica V, 453 A. See above p. 44.

<sup>7</sup>Thucydides III 10, 1: εἰδοῖτες οὐτε φιλιὰν ἰδιώταις βέλβαιον γιγνομένην οὐτε κοινωσίαν πόλεσιν εἰς οὐδεν.



tend to preclude the use of a second genitive.<sup>1</sup> Campbell points out that this is parallel to the disinclination on the part of classical authors to use more than one kind of genitive with koinonia.<sup>2</sup> In the light of such an employment of εἰς with koinoneo in this same letter in a similar context (4:15 ἐκοινώνησεν εἰς λόγον δόσεως καὶ λήψεως) plus the fact that koinonia can then be allowed a more normal meaning, the possibility becomes a strong one.

The question of the connotation of εὐαγγέλιον is less involved. Paul often uses the term in the sense of the total mission of the Gospel (Rom. 1:1; II Cor. 2:12; Gal. 2:7; Phlm. 13). And in the present passage it is used by Paul twice (vss. 7 and 12) in that very sense. In view of the context of both passage and letter, Paul has in mind in 1:5 that participation in the work of the Gospel which he went on to define as (1:7) συκοινωνοὺς μου τῆς χάριτος, (4:14) συκοινωνήσατες μου τῇ θλίψει, and (4:15) ἐκοινώνησεν εἰς λόγον δόσεως καὶ λήψεως.<sup>3</sup> This of course would certainly not exclude but be based upon their participation in the Gospel itself. Campbell suggests that perhaps the use of εἰς makes the above meaning clearer than a genitive would have done.<sup>4</sup> Thus it should not be thought of as merely a genitive substitute, but perhaps more than such.

---

<sup>1</sup>Seesemann, p. 75, says that to avoid ambiguity, Paul would have had to repeat the article which is contrary to classical usage. He notes that Paul does occasionally repeat the article (I Thess. 1:8; Rom. 7:5; 8:29; II Cor. 9:3), but only before a preposition. 3/

<sup>2</sup>Campbell, pp. 372 and 357.

<sup>3</sup>See above pp. 354., 39 f. and 44 f.

<sup>4</sup>Campbell, p. 372.

There is no real objection to this interpretation in 1:6 as Seesemann feels,<sup>1</sup> for the ἐργον ἀγαθόν can well designate this participation.<sup>2</sup> The sense of "close relationship with the Gospel"<sup>3</sup> which Arndt and Gingrich get from Seesemann's interpretation of his rendering is hardly suitable.<sup>4</sup>

The RSV "your partnership in the gospel" fits very well indeed and indicates the horizontal implications of Paul's employment of koinonia. For in Kennedy's words, "this whole passage is concerned with Paul's personal relation to them. And so k. anticipates κοινωνοῦς (ver. 7), and will mean their common participation with Paul in spreading the Gospel."<sup>5</sup> In a letter which throughout witnesses to a unique relationship between apostle and church, there is every reason to believe that Paul had this aspect in mind in his opening inclusive expression, κοινωνία ὑμῶν εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, which is so well able to bear it. Considered as outlined above the expression can well be viewed as a concise comprehensive statement of the theme of the letter.

---

<sup>1</sup>Seesemann, pp. 76f.

<sup>2</sup>Bonnard, p. 16: "Cette 'oeuvre bonne' est-elle la foi produite par Dieu dans le coeur des Philippiens ou la participation des Philippiens à l'oeuvre apostolique, également inspirée par Dieu? Sans doute les deux à la fois mais particulièrement ici la participation des Philippiens à l'apostolat de Paul." Also Lightfoot, Saint Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, p. 84.

<sup>3</sup>Arndt and Gingrich, p. 440.

<sup>4</sup>Seesemann's statement is: "Wenn der Eingangsdank des Phil den entsprechenden Stücken der anderen Briefe gleich angelegt ist, so muss der Ausdruck κοινωνία εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ihr 'Anteilhaben am Evangelium' = ihre 'enge Beziehung zum Evangelium' bedeuten." Pp. 74f.

<sup>5</sup>H. A. A. Kennedy, The Epistle to the Philippians, The Expositor's Greek Testament (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1903), p. 418.

The final occurrence of koinonia in Philippians is in 3:10 where Paul is speaking of his supreme concern to know Christ, τοῦ γνῶραι αὐτὸν καὶ τῆς θύραμις τῆς ἀναστάσεως αὐτοῦ καὶ κοινωνίας παθημάτων αὐτοῦ, συμμορφιζόμενος τῷ θανάτῳ αὐτοῦ. The construction is the normal objective genitive with the resulting primary sense of participation.<sup>1</sup> So obvious is this that even C. A. Scott allows it in the sense of "participation in."<sup>2</sup> The effecting context of this κοινωνίας παθημάτων αὐτοῦ is Paul's γνῶσεως Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ (vs. 8) and his being ἐδρεθῶ ἐν αὐτῷ (vs. 9) which involve the experiential knowledge of τῆς θύραμις τῆς ἀναστάσεως αὐτοῦ.<sup>3</sup> Thus it is in view of his personal relationship with the present living Lord that Paul can consider his actual sufferings as a real participation in the sufferings of Christ (cf. II Cor. 1:5-7;<sup>4</sup> Rom. 8:17; Col. 1:24). As the phrase συμμορφιζόμενος τῷ θανάτῳ αὐτοῦ indicates, the thought is that of the συμ-compounds<sup>5</sup> and the connection is spiritually qualitative rather

<sup>1</sup>Almost all are in agreement here. An exception is Lohmeyer, pp. 138f., who writes: "Wo immer bei Pls. der Begriff 'Gemeinschaft' mit dem Genetiv eines Nomens verbunden ist, das ein religiöses Gut bezeichnet, da gibt dieser Genetiv den Grund und die Norm an, durch welche Gemeinschaft erst möglich und wirklich wird. 'Seine Leiden' stiften also die Gemeinschaft des Gläubigen mit Christus oder Gott." Cf. his discussion on 1:5, 17.

<sup>2</sup>C. A. Scott, "The Communion of the Body," p. 121.

<sup>3</sup>"Auffällig ist in 3 10 die Stellung der ἀναστάσις vor den παθημάτων." M. Dibelius, An die Thessalonicher I - II, an die Philipper, p. 69.

<sup>4</sup>See above pp. 34f.

<sup>5</sup>συζητῶν (Rom. 6:8; II Cor. 7:3), συμπάσχειν (Rom. 8:17), συσταυροῦσθαι (Rom. 6:6; Gal. 2:19), συναπθεῖν (II Cor. 7:3), συνθάπτειν (Rom. 6:4; Col. 2:12), συ-εγείρειν (Col. 2:12; 3:1; Eph. 2:6), συζωοποιεῖν (Col.



than merely historically imitative. It is Paul's possession of or participation in the Spirit of Christ which affords the vital link. Of all the uses of koinonia with the genitive in which there is a possibility of an inner relationship being indicated thereby (I Cor. 1:9, 10:16; II Cor. 13:13; Phil. 2:1), this is one of the more plausible.<sup>1</sup>

Since Paul uses the koinonia language in other parts of the letter to refer to the share which the Philippians have in his tribulations (1:7 and 4:14)<sup>2</sup> and also speaks directly of their being privileged to suffer on behalf of Christ (1:29 *ὁμιρ ἐχαρίσθη τὸ ἐπὲρ Χριστοῦ. . . παύχειρ*),<sup>3</sup> one cannot exclude the horizontal implications of *κοινωνία παθημάτων αὐτοῦ* in 3:10. For as Ahern expresses it:

The word koinōnia introduces into this phrase the spirit of the whole epistle. Throughout he has shown himself vitally conscious of the part which all his fellow Christians play in working and suffering for the gospel . . . . Now in 3, 10, with graceful allusion to the part which his converts play, Paul speaks of his sufferings as a koinōnia of the immense tôn pathēmatōn autou.<sup>4</sup>

Philemon 6, *ὅπως ἡ κοινωνία τῆς πίστεώς σου ἐνεργῆς γένηται ἐν ἐκιννώσει παντὸς ἀγαθοῦ τοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν εἰς Χριστόν*, called by Maule "notoriously the most obscure verse in

2:13; Eph. 2:5), *συγδοξάξει* (Rom. 8:17), *συγκληρονόμος* (Rom. 8:17), *συμβασιλεύει* (II Tim. 2:12).

<sup>1</sup>Seesemann, p. 86. George, p. 184.

<sup>2</sup>See above pp. 35-36, 39-40.

<sup>3</sup>To this Paul significantly adds (v. 30): *τὸν αὐτὸν ἀγῶνα ἔχοντες ὁδὸν εἰδετε ἐν ἐμοὶ καὶ τοὺς ἀκούετε ἐν ἐμοί*.

<sup>4</sup>Barnabas M. Ahern, "The Fellowship of His Sufferings (Phil. 3, 10)--A Study of St. Paul's Doctrine of Christian Suffering," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly XXII (January, 1960), pp. 31f.

this letter,"<sup>1</sup> is the purpose of the apostle's prayer<sup>2</sup> (v. 4). *Εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ μου πάντοτε μετὰ σου ποιούμενος ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου* as indicated by the *ὅπως*. The interpretations of the phrase *ἡ κοινωνία τῆς πίστεώς σου* have been manifold.<sup>3</sup> Added to this are the ambiguities resident in *ἐν ἐπιγνώσει* and *εἰς Χριστόν* with the result that any exegetical judgement will of necessity be quite arbitrary. Yet if one reads this verse in the light of the main concern of the epistle, (and where is this more likely to be first implied than in the opening prayer<sup>4</sup>) a very plausible rendering can be obtained. As has already been observed<sup>5</sup> Paul bases his request upon a partnership in the Faith (vs. 17 *εἰ οὐκ με ἔχεις κοινωνόν, προσλάβοῦ αὐτόν ὡς ἐμέ* ), that is, he appeals to a spiritual reality. Surely Paul was leading up to this appeal in his prayer. If so could not *πартὸς ἀγαθοῦ τοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν* ,<sup>6</sup> while obviously more general, be anticipative of *τὸ ἀγαθόν σου* (vs. 14) which is a direct reference to Paul's request? Similarly the expression *ἡ κοινωνία τῆς πίστεώς σου* , particularly if the genitive is considered to be the usual objective, would anticipate the basis of the

<sup>1</sup>C. F. D. Moule, The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Colossians and to Philemon, p. 142.

<sup>2</sup>J. B. Lightfoot, Saint Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon (London: Macmillan and Co., 1884), p. 334.

<sup>3</sup>These are listed in C. F. D. Moule, The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Colossians and to Philemon, cf. George, p. 183, and Vincent Taylor, Forgiveness and Reconciliation (2nd ed.; London: Macmillan and Co., 1956), p. 111, n. 2.

<sup>4</sup>For example, cf. Phil. 1:5 and the discussion above pp. 71-74.

<sup>5</sup>See above pp. 32f.

<sup>6</sup>*ἡμῖν* is as well attested as *ἡμῖν*.

request of verse seventeen with koinonia meaning common sharing or partnership<sup>1</sup> in. The other most likely translation "communication"<sup>2</sup> is unnecessary in view of ἐρεπγῆς γένηται. Also it is difficult to escape the impression that the previous phrase σου τὴν ἀγάπην καὶ τὴν πίστιν ἣν ἔχεις πρὸς τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν καὶ εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους is bound up in some way with ἡ κοινωρία τῆς πίστεώς σου<sup>3</sup> which would favour the above rendering. Whether σου modifies only πίστewς or the entire phrase, the overall meaning would not be substantially affected as long as the participation in its first reference is held to be that of Philemon. The latter is less ambiguous. Taking εἰς Χριστόν as qualifying the main statement in the sense of ground and goal<sup>4</sup> and ἐν ἐκίγνωσι as perception (cf. Rom. 3:20 and Mt. 7:16) with its usual theological overtones<sup>5</sup> the sense

<sup>1</sup>John Knox, The Epistle to Philemon, p. 5. He notes that "in the same way 7a prepares for verse 20."

<sup>2</sup>Vincent, p. 179, Thornton, p. 38.

<sup>3</sup>Seesemann, p. 81, denies that there is any hint of commonness either with Paul or other Christians implied in the expression, only Philemon's personal participation in faith. In his zeal to refute the subjective genitive of Lohmeyer, he errs in the opposite direction.

<sup>4</sup>This is possibly a metaphorical use of what Moule, An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek, p. 68, calls "the 'pregnant' use" of εἰς with the accusative "apparently combining the ideas of motion and rest." This he says may be synonymous with ἐν, but if so here, this phrase is not to be considered identical with the special Pauline phrase ἐν Χριστῷ. None of Moule's citations in the above category afford a true parallel to Philem. 6.

<sup>5</sup>Moule, The Epistles to the Colossians and Philemon, pp. 160-161, lists every occurrence of ἐκίγνωσις in the New Testament and states that all except Rom. 3:20 are "concerned with the perception of God's will or the recognition of him in his self-revelation in Jesus Christ."



and force of the entire phrase would be "that your partnership in faith may come to expression in the perception of every good thing among us, and this in and for Christ." In this prayer Paul is skilfully beginning to apply to the end in mind that which he affirmed of Philemon in verse five and re-echoes in verse seven. He is praying in verse six generally for that which he specifically asks in verse seventeen. The appeal in both is spiritual, although the mutual sharing expressed by koinonia is broader than the partnership indicated by koinonos which pertains only to Philemon and Paul.

The only instance in which Paul uses koinonia absolutely is in Galatians 2:9, *καὶ γνώριτες τὴν χάριν τῆς δοθεῖσάς μοι, Ἰάκωβος καὶ κηθᾶς καὶ Ἰωάννης, οἱ δοκοῦντες στυλοὶ εἶναι, δεξιάς ἔδωκαν ἐμοὶ καὶ Βαραββᾶ κοινωνίας, ἵνα ἡμεῖς εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, αὐτοὶ δὲ εἰς τὴν περιτομήν.* where its meaning is apparent from the context. The giving of the right hand<sup>1</sup> is the token of the mutual compact expressed in the phrase ἵνα . . . περιτομήν and defined by koinonia as one of partnership.<sup>2</sup> It is in Schlier's words "ein Teilhaberhandschlag."<sup>3</sup> Both dimensions of

<sup>1</sup>Schlier, p. 45, notes that "Δεξιάς δ. δοῦναι ist hier natürlich nicht das Zeichen der Unterwerfung wie I Chron 29 24 II Chron 30 8 Kl 5 6 ( 7<sup>7</sup> 17<sup>7</sup> ), sondern das Zeichen eines friedlichen Vertrages (Xen. anab.<sup>7</sup> 1, 6, 6; 2, 5, 3, IV B40 10 15 I Makk 6 58 11 50. 62. 66 13 50 II Makk 11 26 Esr 10 19 Jos. vit. 30; ant. XVIII 326 u. a.)." Cf. Burton, pp. 95ff., and Adolf Deissmann, Bible Studies, Tr. A. Grieve (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1901), p. 251.

<sup>2</sup>Burton, p. 95. Koinonia is often used in the sense of business partnership. See above p. 20. Cf. James Hope Moulton and George Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1930), p. 351.

<sup>3</sup>Schlier, p. 45.

B40  
(or K)

koinonia are implied and any idea of fellowship must be kept in subordination to that of sharing together in a common enterprise. Paul and Barnabas have been recognized as full partners in the apostolic task<sup>1</sup> in terms of their mission to the Gentiles (cf. vs. 7). Seesemann's<sup>2</sup> insistence that the recognition is not merely that of a common work but likewise designates Paul as *κοινωνὸς Χριστοῦ* overlooks the prime concern here of Paul in respect to the apostolic status of his mission.<sup>3</sup> He has been recognized as a partner-apostle.<sup>4</sup>

The last occurrence of koinonia in the Pauline corpus to be considered is in II Corinthians 6:14 where the phrase *ἢ τίς κοινωνία* *ὁὐτις ἵπὸς σκότος* is one of five rhetorical questions emphasizing "the absolute incongruity between Christians and pagans"<sup>5</sup> (*Μὴ γίνεσθε ἑτεροζυγούμενοι ἀπίστοις*).<sup>6</sup> Although the Pauline character of this whole section, 6:14-7:2, has been seriously questioned,<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Schlier, p. 45, interestingly comments that this absolute use of koinonia does not mean "dass Paulus erst in eine schon bestehende *κοινωνία* aufgenommen wurde, sondern dass ihm die Hand gereicht wurde, der ebenfalls schon in dieser *κοινωνία* stand, durch dessen Übereinkommen mit den anderen die *κοινωνία* jetzt aber in Erscheinung trat."

<sup>2</sup>Seesemann, pp. 86ff., followed by Hauck, p. 809.

<sup>3</sup>Schlier, p. 45, points out concerning *τῆς χάριτος τῆς δοθεῖσας ἡμῖς* that "*χάρις* hat hier den speziellen Sinn von Apostelgnade."

<sup>4</sup>George, p. 185.

<sup>5</sup>Plummer, p. 207.

<sup>6</sup>This light-darkness dualism can be paralleled in Paul (Rom. 13:12; Eph. 5:7; I Thess. 5:4), the New Testament generally (Acts 26:18; I John 1:5-7, 2:9) and other early Christian literature (Barnabas 18:1, Didache 1 lat) as well as in the Jewish writings of that same general period (Slavonic Enoch 30:15; Testament of Levi 19:1; The Manual of Discipline I 9-10; III 19-21).

<sup>7</sup>Cf. the discussion in Windisch, pp. 18ff. and 211ff. Seesemann,

current opinion usually takes it to be either an insertion by a later editor from a lost letter of Paul (cf. I. Cor. 5:9),<sup>1</sup> or as actually integral to the letter and authentic to Paul.<sup>2</sup> The parallel questions with their corresponding key words--μετοχή, συμπύνησις, μερίς and συγκοινωνία --indicate clearly the general sense intended, for the terminology has been varied primarily for effect. Koinonia is used with the associative dative (δωτί) and with the preposition πρὸς<sup>3</sup> which often occurs as a dative substitute.<sup>4</sup> Thus the emphasis rests in the horizontal relation and the meaning of the phrase is best seen in terms of the full natural sense of koinonia in which a vertical base for the relationship is at least implied. Paul means then, "or what does light share (or have in common) with darkness?"

#### The Koinonia Language in the Remainder of the New Testament

The Synoptic Gospels.--The employment of the koinonia language in the Synoptic Gospels is limited to two normal uses of koinonos. In

p. 67, sees here a quite un-Pauline use of koinonia.

<sup>1</sup>Strachan, pp. xv, xx and 3.

<sup>2</sup>Jean Hering, La Seconde Epître de Saint Paul aux Corinthiens, p. 57; Wendland, pp. 7 and 187. Kummel in a note added to Lietzmann, p. 206, remarks: "Der Anschluss ist gewiss abrupt, aber Paulus führt in 6 14ff. nur die ethische Mahnung fort, die er in 6 1f. begonnen hatte, und leitet damit weiter zur Korrespondenz zurück, die er in verschiedener Weise in 6 3ff. 11ff. aufgenommen hatte."

<sup>3</sup>Epictetus II 20, 6: ὅταν ἀραιρεῖν θέλῃ τὴν φυσικὴν κοινωνίαν ἀνθρώποις πρὸς ἀλλήλους; .  
Cf. Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum 646, 53.

<sup>4</sup>See above p. 23. Cf. Aristotle Ethica Nicomachea VIII 10, 4 and Philo De Vita Mosis I 158. As in the previous phrase two datives could have been used, but as Plummer, p. 207 points out, Paul used "four different constructions in five sentences, all



81 Luke 5:10, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ Ζακωβὸν καὶ Ἰωάννην υἱοὺς Ζεβεδαίου, οἳ ἦσαν κοινωροὶ τῷ Σίμωνι, it is found in the technical sense of "business partner" often paralleled in the papyri.<sup>1</sup> Partner in the general sense is of course a usual meaning of koinonos.<sup>2</sup> The dative τῷ Σίμωνι designates who they are partners with in the fishing business. The parallel μέτοχος in verse seven has perhaps in the general meaning of companion.

Although a slightly different construction is involved in Matthew 23:30, οὐκ ἂν ἡμεῖθα αὐτῶν κοινωροὶ ἐν τῷ αἵματι τῶν προφητῶν the meaning is in general the same. The prepositional phrase ἐν τῷ αἵματι τῶν προφητῶν takes the place of the genitive of the thing shared.<sup>3</sup> The genitive of the person, αὐτῶν, indicating "with whom" is probably best considered a possessive in view of the rarity of the genitive as a dative substitute.<sup>4</sup> In any case the meaning is "partakers with them (their partner/s) in the blood of the prophets."

The Acts of the Apostles.--Acts 2:42, ἦσαν δὲ προσκείμενοι τῇ διδαχῇ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῇ κοινῇ, τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου καὶ ταῖς προσευχαῖς, has been the

for the sake of variety."

<sup>1</sup>BGU 1123, 4: ὁμολογοῦμεν εἶναι τοὺς τρεῖς μέτοχους καὶ κοινωνοὺς καὶ κυρίου ἑκάστου κατὰ τὸ τρίτον μέρος. See above p.

<sup>2</sup>See the examples quoted above p.

<sup>3</sup>Plato Phaedo 65 A: εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ ἐν τῇ ζητήσῃ κοινῶν συμπράξαμεν.

<sup>4</sup>See above p. 9.

object of much speculation as to the precise reference of its use of koinonia.<sup>1</sup> This can be seen as far back as the Vulgate which took κοινωνία in apposition to τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἁγίου and which led Blass to conjecture the reading τῇ κοινωνίᾳ τῆς κλάσεως τοῦ ἁγίου.<sup>2</sup> The rhythm and balance of the sentence makes this suggestion unlikely. In recent times the most daring suggestion has been that of C. Anderson Scott who defined τῇ κοινωνίᾳ as "a new name for a new thing, community of spirit issuing in community of life."<sup>3</sup> He translated the phrase concretely by "the Fellowship" remarking that "this Koinonia, called into being by the Holy Spirit, was prior to the organized Ecclesia."<sup>4</sup> He later attempted to maintain that this use of koinonia as an early self-designation of the Christian community was a translation of רַבִּינִי,<sup>5</sup> holding that the disciples were known as the רַבִּינִי of Jesus.<sup>6</sup> But even if the disciples were commonly regarded as the

<sup>1</sup>Kirsopp Lake and Henry J. Cadbury, English Translation and Commentary, Vol. IV, The Beginnings of Christianity, ed. F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake (London: Macmillan and Co., 1933), pp. 27f., and R. Newton Flew, Jesus and His Church (London: The Epworth Press, 1938), pp. 151f., give convenient summaries of the many suggestions.

<sup>2</sup>James Hardy Ropes, The Test of Acts, Vol. III, The Beginnings of Christianity, ed. F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake (London: Macmillan and Co., 1926), pp. 22f.

<sup>3</sup>C. Anderson Scott, "What Happened at Pentecost," The Spirit, ed. B. H. Streeter (London: Macmillan and Co., 1919), p. 137. Cf. C. A. Scott, The Fellowship of the Spirit (London: James Clark and Co., 1921), pp. 69ff.

<sup>4</sup>C. A. Scott, "What Happened at Pentecost," p. 142.

<sup>5</sup>Cf. Hauck, p. 803, David Daube, The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism (London: University of London, the Athlone Press, 1956), pp. 332-334, and Jacob Neusner, "The Fellowship (רַבִּינִי) In the Second Jewish Commonwealth," Harvard Theological Review (April 1960), pp. 125-142.

<sup>6</sup>C. A. Scott, "The 'Fellowship,' or κοινωνία," The Expository

177727 of Jesus, it is very unlikely as Wood<sup>1</sup> pointed out in his rebuttal to Scott in 1921 that koinonia by itself could assume this meaning.

Since recent discussion of the problem has narrowed itself down in the main to two general interpretations, these will be examined in more detail. The first takes it as a somewhat qualitative term descriptive of an "interior spiritual reality, an activity of sharing or communion, constituting the inner bond of that brotherly concord which, in turn, is realized and expressed in the life of the community."<sup>2</sup> The other approach conceives of τῇ κοινωρίᾳ as designating an expression or practice, namely, the having all things common (κοινὰ) mentioned in 2:44 and 4:32.<sup>3</sup> Although some who favour this interpretation view it in

---

Times, XXXV (1923-1924), p. 567. In his great work, Christianity According to St. Paul (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1927), p. 160, he writes: "If, as seems probable, the group of followers whom Jesus gathered most closely round Himself, took or had given to it some distinguishing name, that name would naturally be 'the Chabura of Jesus'; and the name κοινωρία or Fellowship under which it first presents itself in the Acts is simply the Greek for Chabura."

<sup>1</sup>Wood, pp. 33-40. More recent accounts of the objections to Scott's position can be found in Seesemann, pp. 90-92, Flew, pp. 151-153, and George, pp. 135f.

<sup>2</sup>Thornton, p. 451. This is also the position of Seesemann, p. 89, Hauck, p. 809, Flew, p. 152, George, p. 135, and Arndt and Gingrich, p. 440. It accords too with the earlier views of J. Armitage Robinson, "Communion," pp. 460f. and Arthur Carr, "The Fellowship (κοινωρία) of Acts 2:42 and Cognate Words," The Expositor, ed. W. R. Nicoll (8th Series; London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1913), V, p. 459. F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles (Chicago: The Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship, 1952), p. 100, seems to favour this sense for τῇ κοινωρίᾳ when he writes: "Here it may refer to the practice of vv. 44f. below, but not exclusively so, as 'the breaking of the bread and prayers' are also to be understood as expressions of this 'fellowship'."

<sup>3</sup>C. E. B. Cranfield, "Fellowship, Communion," A Theological Word



the context of early Christian worship,<sup>1</sup> it is to be distinguished from the proposal of some who after the analogy of the use of koinonia in Hebrews 13:16 take it to refer here only to the contribution of money as one of the four elements in the worship service.<sup>2</sup> Against this latter is the rarity of koinonia in this sense<sup>3</sup> as well as the fact so well pointed out recently by Haenchen that this verse can hardly be limited to an early Christian worship service.<sup>4</sup>

Acts 2:42 introduces a summary section which does not appear to represent any possible Aramaic source<sup>5</sup> available to Luke. This descrip-

---

Book of the Bible, ed. Alan Richardson (London: S. C. M. Press, 1950), p. 82. Cf. Wood, p. 33; D. Ernst Haenchen, Die Apostelgeschichte, Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament (12th revised ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1959), p. 153; Bo Reicke, Glauben und Leben der Urgemeinde, Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments 32 (Zurich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1957), p. 57; and David M. Stanley, "Liturgical Influences on the Formation of the Four Gospels," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXI (January 1959), pp. 24-38.

<sup>1</sup>Reicke, pp. 56-61, believes that in verses 42-47 Luke presents the whole life of the Christian community in the context of temple worship (Tempelgottesdienst).

<sup>2</sup>Campbell, p. 374. Jeremias, p. 83, n. 3.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Acts 24:17 and Thornton, p. 73.

<sup>4</sup>Haenchen, p. 153.

<sup>5</sup>Matthew Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts (2nd ed.; Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1954), p. 207, concludes that "the most likely places where Semitic sources were used by Luke, apart from the sayings of Jesus, are in the first two chapters of his Gospel and in the speeches of Peter and Stephen in the early chapters of Acts." Others are more willing to allow for the use of such sources. For recent discussions see Wilfred L. Knox, The Acts of the Apostles (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1948), pp. 16-39, Bruce, pp. 21-26, Haenchen, pp. 72-80, C. S. C. Williams, A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1957), pp. 7-13. There is little doubt that Luke used traditional material of some sort, oral or written, in the first fifteen chapters. Cf. Reicke, pp. 7f.

tive picture of the life of the newly Pentecost-moulded community comes, rather, direct from his pen as a stylistic bridge between the happenings of the day of Pentecost and the relating of the events which follow in the life of the primitive church.<sup>1</sup> Its content was of course rooted in tradition (cf. 4:32-5:11).<sup>2</sup> As the transition to the summary 2:42 presents the reader with a more general characterization of the Christian community, even if the whole account as Reicke suggests is permeated by a temple-worship motif.<sup>3</sup> To allow his premise does not necessarily demand his conclusion that the four phrases all refer in his words to "praktische Ausdrücke des Gottesdienstlebens"<sup>4</sup> thereby understanding  $\tau\eta\ \kappa\alpha\iota\nu\omega\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha$  as an exclusive reference to the practice of verse forty-four as administered by the apostles.<sup>5</sup> Haenchen who takes the same general position as to the meaning of  $\tau\eta\ \kappa\alpha\iota\nu\omega\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha$  makes no appeal to

---

<sup>1</sup>Haenchen, p. 157. Martin Dibelius, Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, ed. Heinrich Greeven and tr. Mary Ling (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1956), pp. 9f. Cf. Henry J. Cadbury, "The Summaries in Acts," Additional Notes to the Commentary, ed. Kirsopp Lake and Henry J. Cadbury, Vol. V. The Beginnings of Christianity, ed. F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake (London: Macmillan and Co., 1933), pp. 392-402.

<sup>2</sup>Reicke, p. 58. Haenchen, p. 157. Cf. Heinrich Zimmermann, "Die Sammelberichte der Apostelgeschichte," Biblische Zeitschrift 5 (January 1961), pp. 71-82 for an interesting attempt to separate the Lukan from the traditional material and to show how Luke may have composed the three summaries 2:42-47; 4:32-35; 5:11-16.

<sup>3</sup>Reicke, p. 58 on verse 42 concludes: "So bekommt man unvermeidlich den Eindruck, dass die Gemeinschaft der ersten Christen von Lukas als eine kultische oder liturgische dargestellt worden ist, indem sie in einem ununterbrochenen Tempelgottesdienst unter der Leitung der Apostel bestanden habe."

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 57.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid. "eine von den Aposteln ausgehende Wirksamkeit."

any worship motif.<sup>1</sup> Thus with Haenchen the verse is best viewed as an introductory designation of the characteristic marks of the early church at this stage, even though the verse may be filled with cultic or liturgical overtones.<sup>2</sup> Either of the two interpretations of the preceding paragraph remain possible.

The interpretation of Cranfield, Reicke and Haenchen is suggested by the proximity of  $\kappa\omicron\iota\nu\acute{\alpha}$  in 2:44, but it is highly improbable that the author would have used the term in such a technical and exclusive way before this feature of the life of the church had been mentioned. For koinonia with the definite article, particularly in its parallel relation to the other members of the sentence, suggests something already familiar to the reader. As Thornton points out, "by the time Acts was written it could no longer be assumed that the primitive experiment in 'communism' would be familiar to readers without previous explanation."<sup>3</sup> So while the two cannot be exactly identified, in view of the similar language it can be posited that  $\tau\eta\ \kappa\omicron\iota\nu\omega\nu\acute{\iota}\alpha$  anticipates the actual practice of 2:44-45. Further it is apparent from the construction of the sentence that "the koinonia" must be something as fundamental to and definitely characteristic of the life of the community as the other three. The omission of a  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  before  $\tau\eta\ \kappa\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\iota$  indicates that the

<sup>1</sup>Haenchen, p. 153.

<sup>2</sup>Williams, p. 71 remarks that "the definite article before the nouns suggests that they are semi-technical terms denoting not only a new basis for society but also Christian liturgical custom."

<sup>3</sup>Thornton, p. 73. The generalizing nature of this verse according to Zimmermann's reconstruction of Luke's literary technic would also tend to be against this identification. P. 80.



four distinguishing marks fall into two groups.<sup>1</sup> The second group, *τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ ταῖς προσευχαῖς*, characterizes the early Christians by their participation in certain religious activities. In accordance with *τῇ διδασκῇ τῶν ἀποστόλων* which cannot be confined to the activity of instruction,<sup>2</sup> the first group appears to have a tendency to be of a more qualitative nature. That is, they were distinguished not merely by their attendance at the sessions of apostolic instruction but also by their adherence in faith and life to the apostolic teaching.<sup>3</sup> The result involves the process. Could not "the koinonia" be similarly conceived of as a qualitative result of a spiritual process which is integral to it? Such would certainly square with the anticipative function of *τῇ κοινωνίᾳ* as a deeper and broader reality of which the community of goods was a consequence.

Pointing very definitely to this conclusion is the similar account in 4:32 where the author is perhaps more closely related to his sources:<sup>4</sup> "Now the company of those who believed were of one heart and soul (*καρδία καὶ ψυχὴ μία*), and no one said that any of the things which he possessed was his own, but they had everything in common (*πάντα κοινά*). Here the fact of *πάντα κοινά* is clearly represented as a direct manifestation of *καρδία καὶ ψυχὴ μία*.<sup>5</sup> It

<sup>1</sup>Lake and Cadbury, The Beginnings of Christianity, Vol. IV, p. 28. George, p. 132.

<sup>2</sup>But cf. Reicke, p. 57

<sup>3</sup>Seesemann, p. 88. Arndt and Gingrich, p. 191.

<sup>4</sup>Haenchen, p. 157.

<sup>5</sup>The stress which there seems to be in 2:42-47 on *ὁμοθυμαδόν* (2:46; cf. 5:12; 1:14; 4:24) and *ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ* (2:44; cf. 1:15; 2:1) which may be expressions antecedent source-wise to

is difficult to escape the conclusion that Luke in 2:42 attempted by τῇ κοινωρίᾳ to depict a positive spiritual reality interior to the community<sup>1</sup>--a sharing-together that resulted in an "inward bond which necessarily called for outward acts in which it could be expressed."<sup>2</sup> In fact the whole passage exhibits varied expressions and manifestations of "the koinonia," the most picturesque being "the having all things in common." In accord with the basic meaning of the koinonia language<sup>3</sup> it is proper procedure to expect that this quality of community life which had such striking consequences arises out of and is a "sharing-together" in something. Here whether explicit or merely implied this amazing unanimity of spirit can only be accounted for by a sharing-together in that outpouring of the Holy Spirit related in the early part of the chapter and further unfolded in significance by Peter's sermon. It is the

---

both 2:42 and 4:32a would suggest that Luke was attempting by κοινωρίᾳ to interpret and express more abstractly (perhaps in Pauline terminology) the togetherness and unity (cf. Reicke, p. 21, on συνοθυσμός, quoted below p. 222, n. 3) implied in the former terms or expressions. Zimmermann, pp. 45-79, sees Luke's use both of κοινωρία (2:42) and καρδιά καὶ ψυχὴ μία (4:32a) dependent upon the πάντες δὲ οἱ ἡστέροιστες ἦσαν ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ of 2:44a. He analyses the three summaries (2:42-47; 4:32-35; 5:11-16) into three tradition accounts consisting of 2:41, 44a, 46, 47; 4:32b, 34, 35 and 5:11, 12a, 15 concerning respectively the religious life of the community, the exercise of brotherly love and the mighty acts of the apostles.

<sup>1</sup>Interestingly similar is Philo's use of koinonia in description of the Essenes. In Quod Omnis Liber Sit 84 and 91 he twice speaks of their τὴν πάντος λόγου κρείττονα κοινωρίαν. Cf. Hypothetica XI 1, 14 and De Vita Contemplativa 24 concerning the Therapeutae. For other similar applications of koinonia cf. Seesemann, pp. 88f.

<sup>2</sup>Flew, p. 153.

<sup>3</sup>See above p. 29.

6/ nature of the common object, the Holy Spirit, which determines the unique character of "the koinonia" as a fundamental feature of the community life. With τῇ κοινυνίᾳ even more than with τῇ δ.σαχῇ τ.σ. is the process inseparably bound up with the result. Although the stress lies in the horizontal quality of human relationship, its dynamic vertical basis is an essential element in the Lukan expression, for it is their constant sharing-together in the Holy Spirit which constitutes this appealing feature of their life together. Their common life as Luke described it was rooted in two basic realities, the teaching of the apostles and the sharing-together in the Holy Spirit. Further, it was centered in two important religious activities, the breaking of bread and the prayers.

Hebrews.--Sparse use is made of the koinonia language<sup>1</sup> by the Hebrew's writer who employs each of the three forms only once. Koinonos occurs in 10:33, τοῦτο μὲν ὀνειδισμοῖς τε καὶ θλίψεσιν θεατρικῶς, τοῦτο δὲ κοινῶς τῶν οὕτως ἀναστρεφόμενων γεννηθέντες to designate those who share in the reproach and affliction of their fellow Christians. Κοινῶς . . . γεννηθέντες is periphrastic and connotes little more than would κοινῶν ἄρτες.<sup>2</sup> Thus it could be translated with Moffatt "by

<sup>1</sup>More significant is his use of μετέχουσιν (1:9; 3:1; 3:14; 6:14; 12:8) and μετέχω (2:14; 5:13; 7:13), for three of the former in which Christians are partakers of a 'heavenly calling' (3:1), of 'Christ' (3:14) and of 'Holy Spirit' (6:4) are very similar to Paul's use of koinonia in I Cor. 1:9, II Cor. 13:13 and Phil. 2:1.

<sup>2</sup>B. F. Westcott, The Epistle to the Hebrews (London: Macmillan and Co., 1906), p. 38, notes that the verb always retains its force in these periphrastic forms with γίνουσι which are so frequent with the Hebrew's writer (3:14; 5:5, 12; 6:4; 7:12, 18).



making common cause with those who fared thus"<sup>1</sup> or with the RSV "being partners with those so treated." The genitive is used here to perform the function more normally carried out by the dative.

In 2:14, Ἐπεὶ ὦν τὰ παιδία κεκοινώνηκεν αἵματος καὶ σαρκός, καὶ αὐτὸς παραπλησιῶς μετέσχευ τῶν αὐτῶν, is the only instance of koinoneo in the New Testament with the genitive of the thing shared. This corresponds with the classical character of the Greek in Hebrews. Although μετέσχω occurs in the same sentence with the like force of participate, they need not be considered exactly synonymous for the idea of a "common sharing" better expressed by koinoneo than by μετέσχω cannot be arbitrarily excluded from the first phrase. As Westcott comments:

The present different ideas. κεκοινώνηκε marks the common nature ever shared among men as long as the race lasts: μετέσχευ expresses the unique fact of the Incarnation as a voluntary acceptance of humanity.<sup>2</sup>

The main force of the two, however, is admittedly identical.

Koinonia is used absolutely in 13:16, τῆς δὲ εὐκοιτίας καὶ κοινωρίας μὴ ἐπιδανθάρεσθε. τοιαῦται γὰρ θυσίαις εὐαρεστοῦται ὁ θεός. Its close proximity to εὐκοιτίας (the doing of good)<sup>3</sup> as indicated by the single τῆς governing both nouns<sup>4</sup> makes it certain that here it is used similarly to that in Romans

20, 23; 10:33; 11:6f.; 12:8)

<sup>1</sup>James Moffatt, The New Testament in the Moffatt Translation (Revised ed.; London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1934).

<sup>2</sup>Westcott, p. 52.

<sup>3</sup>Arndt and Gingrich, p. 324.

<sup>4</sup>Westcott, p. 446.

15:26 and II Corinthians 9:13 in the sense of the attitude or action of "contributing." As shown above<sup>1</sup> this use is derived from the possible meaning of koinoneo "to give a share" (cf. Gal. 6:6). The verbally turned translation of the RSV adequately portrays the sense: "Do not neglect to do good and to share what you have, for such sacrifices are pleasing to God."<sup>2</sup>

I and II Peter.---Although koinonia itself does not occur in the Petrine literature its cognates do appear in significant contexts. The only difficulty involved in I Peter 5:1, ὁ καὶ τῆς μελλούσης ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι δόξης κοινωνός, is in what sense is Peter a sharer in τῆς μελλούσης ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι δόξης, for the construction is the normal genitive of the thing shared. The usual interpretation<sup>3</sup> makes the future tense expressed in μελλούσης cover κοινωνός as well, linking the expression to the promise made to the Apostle by Christ in Matthew 19:28 and John 13:36.<sup>4</sup> But Selwyn<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>See above pp. 12f. and pp. 24f.

<sup>2</sup>The Germans can be more literal as the "Die Wohltätigkeit und Mittheilbarkeit aber vergesst nicht" of Hans Windisch indicates. Der Hebräerbrief, Vol. XIV, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. Hans Lietzmann (2nd newly revised ed.; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr Paul Siebeck, 1931), p. 118.

<sup>3</sup>Charles Bigg, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude, The International Critical Commentary (2nd ed.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902), p. 187.

<sup>4</sup>Francis Wright Beare, The First Epistle of Peter (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1947), p. 173, would say that "the thought is both present and future; Peter now shares the glory of Christ in heaven; he is likewise to share in the imminent 'revelation'." Cf. Hauck, p. 807.

<sup>5</sup>Edward Gordon Selwyn, The First Epistle of St. Peter (2nd. ed.; London: Macmillan and Co., 1947), pp. 228f., gives a detailed argument. But cf. George, p. 228.

shows the likelihood of this statement being a definite allusion to Peter's part in the Transfiguration. Among his reasons in the interpretation of the true meaning of the experience as eschatological, giving a foretaste of the glory of the Parousia.<sup>1</sup> Either interpretation, in that the *ὁ καί* seems to mark this as something peculiar to the Apostle,<sup>2</sup> would leave the horizontal aspect entirely in the background.

I Peter 4:13, ἀλλὰ καθὼς κοινωνεῖτε τοῖς τοῦ χριστοῦ παθήμασι χαίρετε, ἵνα καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ χαρῇτε ἀγαλλιώμενοι, employs the dative of the thing with koinoneo. This may be no more than the dative of common cause, but more probably is the refined usage of the dative which can be viewed as a genitive substitute as in Romans 15:27 and possibly Philippians 4:14, Ephesians 5:11, I Timothy 5:22 and Romans 12:13.<sup>3</sup> The thought context is that indicated earlier in the epistle in 2:20ff. and 3:17ff., and though not as fully developed as that expressed by Paul with koinonos in II Corinthians 1:5-7 and with koinonia in Philippians 3:10 (cf. Rom. 8:17; Col. 1:24), being closer bound to an imitation theme, the similarity is striking. George postulates that here "we have a pre-Pauline theme which Paul was able to take and mould to new ends."<sup>4</sup> In

<sup>1</sup>Selwyn, p. 229. According to his article, "Eschatology in I Peter," The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology, ed. W. D. Davies and D. Daube (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1956), p. 397, even apart from the Transfiguration he would hold to the present sense for *κοινωνός*, saying that "*κοινωνήσω* was readily available if that were what the author meant." He would liken the meaning then to Paul's application of *ἁρραβών*.

<sup>2</sup>Bigg, p. 187.

<sup>3</sup>See above pp. 37-43.

<sup>4</sup>George, p. 227.



I Peter the thought is simply that "Christians share in Christ's sufferings through the experience of a like persecution and opprobrium, and through 'arming themselves' with the same temper of meekness and patience."<sup>1</sup>

One of the most striking uses of the koinonia language is that in II Peter 1:4, *δι' ὧν τὰ τίμια καὶ μέγιστα ἡμῶν ἐπαγγελματα δεδωρηται, ἵνα διὰ τούτων γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως, ἅποφυγόντες τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς*,<sup>2</sup> where the language not the grammar is the problem for koinonos is coupled with the partitive genitive. The "common" aspect of the terms, though not to be excluded, carries little emphasis. The idea range is roughly that indicated by Paul's use of koinonia in I Corinthians 1:9, II Corinthians 13:13 and Philippians 2:1 and by the use of *μετόχος* in Hebrews 3:14 and 6:4 (cf. Heb. 12:10 and II Cor. 3:18) but the phraseology has a Hellenistic ring.<sup>3</sup> In contrast to any pagan conception, however, here the Christian only by grace becomes partaker of the divine nature.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Selwyn, The First Epistle of St. Peter, p. 221.

<sup>2</sup>Deissmann, p. 368, n. 2 notes a similarity of expression in a 1st century B. C. inscription: *πᾶσι θεοῖς φύσεως κοινωνοῦντες ἀνθρωπίνῃ*.

<sup>3</sup>The word *θεῖος* used here for the second time in the Epistle occurs elsewhere in the New Testament only in Acts 17:29 where Paul is speaking to cultivated Greeks. Cf. Hermann Kleinknecht, "*θεῖος*," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. Gerhard Kittel (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1938), III, 122f. Kleinknecht comments: "So begegnet *θεῖος* auch im Neuen Testament nur in hellenistisch gefärbten Schriften bzw. Stücken, ohne dass freilich mit dieser unpersönlichen Ausdruckweise der persönliche Gottesglaube irgend preisgegeben wäre."

<sup>4</sup>Bigg, p. 254.

The Johannine Literature.--Apart from the first chapter of I

John the use of the koinonia language in the Johannine literature is sparse. Yet it appears in familiar contexts. In Revelation 1:9 John

describes himself to his readers as ὁ ἀδελφὸς ὑμῶν καὶ συγκοινωνὸς ἐν τῇ θλίψει καὶ βασιλείᾳ καὶ ὑπομονῇ ἐν Ἰησοῦ <sup>1</sup> in language reminiscent of Philippians 4:14 (συγκοινωνή-

σαυτες μου τῇ θλίψει ) and I Peter 4:13 (κοινωνεῖτε τοῖς τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθήματι). The participation extends also to βασιλείᾳ καὶ ὑπομονῇ ἐν Ἰησοῦ .<sup>2</sup> The "patient endurance in Christ" is

the connecting link between "the tribulation" and "the kingdom" which is here primarily future.<sup>3</sup> That the emphasis is upon the horizontal aspect

of the participation is demonstrated by both the compound form and the close connection of ἀδελφός and συγκοινωνός as indicated by the absence of the article before the second noun.<sup>4</sup> The use of sugkoinonos is grammatically normal with the general meaning of "fellow-partaker" or

<sup>1</sup>For koinonos with ἐν cf. Mt. 23:30 above p. 82.

<sup>2</sup>According to R. H. Charles, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John, The International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1920), I, 21, ἐν Ἰησοῦ should be connected with ὑπομονῇ only. Cf. II Thess. 3:5, τὴν ὑπομονὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Ernst Lohmeyer, Die Offenbarung des Johannes, Vol. XVI, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. Günther Bornkamm (2nd revised ed.; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr Paul Siebeck, 1953), p. 15, favours the reading ἐν ὑπομονῇ Ἰησοῦ.

<sup>3</sup>R. H. Charles, p. 21. Henry Barclay Swete, The Apocalypse of St. John (3rd ed.; Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmann's Publishing Co., 1909-1951), p. 12, observes that "the obvious order is θλίψις, ὑπομονή, βασιλεία, but that which is adopted here has the advantage of leaving on the reader's mind the thought of the struggle which still remains before the kingdom is attained."

<sup>4</sup>R. H. Charles, p. 21.

"partner in."

The only other occurrence of the word group in Revelation is that of sugkoinoneo in 18:4, ἵνα μὴ συγκαοινωρήσῃτε ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις αὐτῆς, where as has been noted in reference to Ephesians 5:11 and I Timothy 5:22 the usage may be that of the regular dative "having to do with" or the possible dative of the thing shared.<sup>1</sup> The latter is probably to be preferred. The general meaning would be the same either way, a warning against becoming involved in the sins of Babylon.

Very similar in meaning and construction is II John 11, ὁ λέγων γὰρ αὐτῷ χαίρει κοινοῦεῖ τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ τοῖς κληροῖς, only here the specific context is the treatment of heretics. The comment of Westcott is noteworthy: "The word κοινοῦεῖν

implies more than participation in the definite acts. It suggests fellowship with the character of which they are the outcome."<sup>2</sup>

Coming finally to the fascinating use of koinonia in I John 1:3-7 Thornton is not far afield in saying that "here we are confronted with the impossibility of translating the word koinonia."<sup>3</sup> The passage reads:

that which we have seen and heard we proclaim also to you, so that you may have fellowship with us (ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς κοινωρίαν ἔχητε μεθ' ἡμῶν); and our fellowship (ἡ κοινωρία δὲ ἡ ἡμετέρα) is with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ. And we are writing this that our joy may be complete.

This is the message we have heard from him and proclaim to you,

<sup>1</sup>See above pp. 37-41. Campbell, pp. 364-366.

<sup>2</sup>B. F. Westcott, The Epistles of St. John (London: Macmillan and Co., 1905), p. 231.

<sup>3</sup>Thornton, p. 157.



that God is light and in him is no darkness at all. If we say we have fellowship with him (κοινωνία ἔχομεν μετ' αὐτοῦ) while we walk in darkness, we lie and do not live according to the truth; but if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship with one another (κοινωνία ἔχομεν μετ' ἀλλήλων), and the blood of Jesus his Son cleanses us from all sin.

It being unlikely that the author would employ koinonia in such close proximity to itself and with identical grammatical constructions in differing basic senses, the problem centers in a meaning compatible with the human (μεθ' ἡμῶν<sup>1</sup> . . . μετ' ἀλλήλων<sup>2</sup>) and divine (μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς . . . μετ' αὐτοῦ [ὁ Θεός]) dimensions of the μετὰ phrases. For it would indeed be arbitrary to attribute different functions to the prepositional phrases, for example to conceive of the former as performing the role of the associative dative and the latter as a substitute for the partitive genitive. Both are obviously primarily the former. This same shift of reference in the qualifying constructions makes it hardly plausible that the thought of "having a share" would be

<sup>1</sup>Though infrequent, the expression of the person with whom there is koinonia by μετὰ with the genitive can be paralleled in classical writers. One is Aeschines II 54: τὴν τῶν πραγμάτων μετὰ φιλοκράτους κοινωνίαν (quoted from Campbell, p. 372). The usual preposition is πρὸς (see above p. 23) occurs in Epictetus II 19,27: περὶ τῆς πρὸς τὸν Δία κοινωνίας βουλευόμενον often cited as similar to the usage of koinonia in I John. Cf. Douglas Sharp, Epictetus and the New Testament (London: Charles Kelley, 1914), p. 111. This general use of πρὸς can be further seen in Josephus De Bello Judaico VII and Contra Apionem II 208.

<sup>2</sup>The reading αὐτοῦ supported by Alexandrinus, Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian is championed by Seesemann, p. 93. It alleviates the abruptness of a new thought and harmonizes better with the phrase about the blood of Jesus, but due to the paucity of evidence it is better viewed as an early correction for those very reasons. Cf. George, p. 212. Further it portrays better the total concept surrounding koinonia (cf. v. 3 and the discussion below) than does the more superficially harmonious αὐτοῦ. Cf. also the further use of ἀλλήλους in I John 3:23, 4:7, 12 and II John 5.

at the forefront, for the common object while perhaps implicit is certainly not explicit in the passage. The sense then is best looked for in the same area of emphasis as Acts 2:42 and Galatians 2:9, those meanings which are rooted in the naked idea of "sharing." This is reinforced by the fact that even those who shy away from it in all other instances in the New Testament admit that fellowship<sup>1</sup> is the first meaning here.<sup>2</sup> George notes that "μετα" cries out for the translation 'fellowship'.<sup>3</sup> To allow this may satisfy the needs of the translator, but it hardly suffices to account for the terminology. "Fellowship" can itself be ambiguous.

In verse three the καὶ . . . δε with its force of "yes, and"<sup>4</sup> indicates that the author is defining a spiritual reality which lies behind his further use of koinonia in verses six and seven--a koinonia that is both with "all Christians"<sup>5</sup> and "with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ." This is presented as the purpose and result of the apostolic witness whose focal point is τοῦ λόγου τῆς ζωῆς.<sup>6</sup> It

---

<sup>1</sup>Seesemann, p. 94, who translates koinonia in I John with "Gemeinschaft" says that this meaning here is not contested. This writer is not qualified to judge the comparative merits of "Gemeinschaft" and "fellowship" as renderings of koinonia. C. H. Dodd, The Johannine Epistles, The Moffatt New Testament Commentary (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1948), p. 6, remarks that fellowship "has been overworked in recent years, and has been flattened and reduced in significance." Possibly the same could be said for "Gemeinschaft."

<sup>2</sup>Campbell, p. 372.

<sup>3</sup>George, p. 213.

<sup>4</sup>C. F. D. Moule, An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek, p. 165.

<sup>5</sup>Cf. the thorough discussion concerning the use of the pronouns in John by Dodd, pp. 9-16.

<sup>6</sup>This is not an exclusive reference to the personal Word as in

is a fellowship on the basis of or in "the word of life."<sup>1</sup> The recognition of this plus the defining clause of verse 3b (καὶ ἡ κοινωρία δὲ ἡ ἡμετέρα μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ) makes it clear with Bernard Weiss in 1899 "dass die κοινωρία, um die es sich handelt, nicht irgend eine Geistes- oder Liebesgemeinschaft, sondern eine Lebensgemeinschaft ist."<sup>2</sup> In English one can speak of a "fellowship or sharing of life" which all Christians have "with one another" and "with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ" when they do not "walk in darkness" but "walk in the light as he is in the light." The final phrase "and the blood of Jesus his Son cleanseth us from all sin"<sup>3</sup> more precisely defines the foundation of the "fellowship" or "life sharing" which is at once with fellow-Christians and with God.<sup>4</sup> "Fellowship" properly understood as rooted in a common sharing can thus be said to be the first meaning of koinonia in I John. The uniqueness of the usage lies in his relating it to man and God in an identical manner.

The strangeness of this is mitigated by viewing the usage in the

John 1:1-18 but rather "to the whole Gospel, of which he is the centre and sum." Wescott, The Epistles of St. John, p. 7. But cf. Robert Law, The Tests of Life (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909), pp. 44f., for a contrary exegesis at this point. Verse 2 is parenthetical.

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Seesemann, p. 97, and Bernhard Weiss, Die Drei Briefe des Apostel Johannes, Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament (6th revised ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1899), p. 27.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 28.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. I Cor. 10:16 and Heb. 2:14.

<sup>4</sup>Expressively in accord is the statement of Law, p. 195: "This Life, as it streams through humanity, creates a family-fellowship (κοινωρία) at once human and Divine."



context of the Johannine mode of thought. Closing the first basic paragraph (1:5-2:6) after the prologue whose theme is "walking in the light" is this capping statement: "By this we may be sure that we are in him (ἐν αὐτῷ ἔσμεν): he who says he abides in him (ἐν αὐτῷ μένειν) ought to walk in the same way in which he walked." The thought of the words in parenthesis is very similar to that of 1:3b, suggesting a definite relation between the use of koinonia in I John 1:3-7 and the concept more usually expressed verbally in the Johannine literature by εἶναι ἐν or μένειν ἐν (cf. I John 2:24, 4:12ff.; John 14:20-23, 15:4-11, 17:20-23). Only once apart from I John 1:3-7 is this thought expressed by a substantive. In John 13:8 Jesus says to Peter: εἰ μὴ νύψωτε, οὐκ ἔχετε μέρος μετ' ἐμοῦ (cf. II Cor. 6:14). John 17:21 is the most suggestive parallel for the concept involved in I John 1:3: ἵνα πάντες ἐν ὧσιν, καθὼς σύ, πατήρ, ἐν ἐμοὶ καὶ ἐγὼ ἐν σοί, ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ὧσιν. There is naturally some difference in the statement of this concept in the Gospel and the Epistle even in its verbal expression. This can be accounted for in part by the more Theocentric emphasis of the Epistle.<sup>1</sup> The infrequency of the use of koinonia in the Johannine literature, though the thought for which he employs it is often present, is accounted for by the tendency of the author to avoid abstract nouns except where the verbal expression would not suffice.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>"In the Gospel we ascend from the historic revelation, the visible Christ, to that conception of the invisible God which He embodies. In the Epistle we start from that conception. Instead of the concrete presentment of the living Christ, there is an immediate intuition of the Divine nature revealed in Him." Ibid., pp. 196f.

<sup>2</sup>Seesemann, pp. 98f.

This infrequent use of koinonia makes it impossible to designate it as a technical religious term for the author. Yet it must be said that he certainly does not use it in a religiously neutral manner for he weights it with potent spiritual impact in verse three in preparation for his further use of it in verses six and seven. It is not too much to affirm that it is employed to express the heart of Johannine theology.

### Conclusion

When an attempt is made to evaluate the use of koinonia and cognates in the New Testament one of the pertinent questions is the degree of intimacy or the extent of the idea of (a bond of) unity indicated or implied in the language. This question is really two in accordance with the dual-dimensional reference of the language. Basic to both, however, is the evident fact that any such meaning is of necessity secondary and subordinate, that is, it has its roots in or arises out of a common participation whether the accent be on the "common" or upon the "participation." Easiest to assess is the probability of the expression of a sense of oneness, unity or togetherness on a horizontal plane resulting from a common sharing in something. Apparent instances of the incorporation of this idea are Philippians 1:7, Philemon 17 and possible II Corinthians 8:23 with (sug) koinonos, Revelation 1:9 and Philippians 4:14 with sugkoinoneo. Among the occurrences of koinonia which definitely imply this horizontal bond of unity are Acts 2:42, I Corinthians 1:9, 10:16, Galatians 2:9, Philippians 1:5, Philemon 6 and especially I John 1:3-7. One may with less certainty include Philippians 2:1 and II Corinthians 13:13. It is also possible that other instances of all three cognate words in the New Testament could well

include this idea. It must be emphasized that this accent of meaning is as much dependent upon the unique nature of that which is shared as upon the innate capability of the koinonia language. George is perhaps right when he observes that "*κοινωνία* is a colourless word which derives warmth and intimacy from its contexts."<sup>1</sup> In the New Testament the context is assuredly the controlling factor in this regard.

The question of intimacy is more difficult when directed to the vertical dimension of koinonia involving the Divine Person as in I Corinthians 1:9, 10:16, II Corinthians 13:13, Philipians 2:1, 3:10 (cf. I Peter 4:13) and I John 1:3, 6. One writer has maintained that "*κοινωνία* implies a closeness of union approaching to identity."<sup>2</sup> Seesemann writes of "ein inniges Anteilhaben . . . das schon beinahe den Charakter des Einswerden annimmt."<sup>3</sup> On the basis of the previous study of the passages involved the first category can firmly be held to be that of "having a share in" and any sense of "close relationship to" or "union with" is resultant from the nature of that which is partaken of. Thus this sense is a part of or an implication from the larger meaning. The usage in I John 1:3, 6-7 is unique in the New Testament due to the peculiar character of Johannine thought, but even there the resultant meaning cannot be completely divorced from its broader foundations.

A second problem is the character of the religious use of the terminology in the New Testament. Although almost all of the occurrences of the language are in some sense in religious contexts,<sup>4</sup> some being

---

<sup>1</sup>George, p. 244.

<sup>2</sup>Carr, p. 462.

<sup>3</sup>Seesemann, p. 86.

<sup>4</sup>Mt. 23:30 and Luke 5:10 are exceptions.



more distinctly thus used than others, koinonia is always employed in this manner. The problem centres in whether koinonia carries in itself a distinctive religious flavour for the New Testament writers or is solely dependent on its contexts for this as well as for its particular religious function.<sup>1</sup> Seesemann, observing that Paul never uses koinonia in a purely secular manner<sup>2</sup> and that it appears once (II Cor. 13:13) next to the religious concepts of  $\chi\rho\iota\varsigma$  (cf. II Cor. 8:4) and  $\alpha\gamma\alpha\pi\eta$  "offenbar der gleichen Sphäre wie diese angehört,"<sup>3</sup> maintains that it is a religious term for him. He differentiates this special Pauline use from that of the remainder of the New Testament whose use of koinonia he says does not differ from that of classical and Hellenistic Greek. Two observations militate against the hard and fast line Seesemann seems to have drawn. First is that some of the other New Testament uses, I John 1:3-7 in particular and Acts 2:42 according to the exegesis of this chapter, give koinonia as definite a religious content as any other. Second, while the use is consistently religious in the Pauline literature, there is no consistent application of the religious use, for no two occurrences<sup>4</sup> can be termed identical in expression and implication. The nearest are Philippians 2:1 and II Corinthians 13:13, but even these have differing implications. Thus there is certainly no technical use of koinonia into which a specific religious content can be poured in every instance. This, of course, was not what Seesemann meant. Yet in

---

<sup>1</sup>These will be outlined in this conclusion.

<sup>2</sup>He excludes II Cor. 6:14 as non-Pauline.

<sup>3</sup>Seesemann, p. 99.

<sup>4</sup>The two occurrences in I Cor. 10:16 are considered as one usage.

view of the total employment of the koinonia language in the New Testament it is probably best to go only so far as to say that while Paul does make definite religious use of the terminology, that use is primarily dependent upon the contexts and not necessarily upon any religious colouring which the words or word may have held for Paul in his use of them. This is not to deny that Paul in greater measure than any other New Testament author found the language particularly religiously useful, but it is to say that the difference between them is mainly one of degree rather than of kind. The New Testament use of the terminology can in general be described as religious, but none of them could be considered technically such in any particular writer. Seesemann does have a point, but it is not as clear cut as he implies.

Granted that there is no technical use of koinonia in the New Testament in the sense that a particular idea can be inserted in many of its instances, yet in view of the fact that the majority of the occurrences can be styled religious, it is possible to conceive of a synthesizing idea to which many of the particular uses bear witness in some way. The possibility of this lies more in the unique dual-dimensional capacity of the koinonia language than in any conscious design of the New Testament authors. The abstract *τῇ κοινῳνίᾳ* in Acts 2:42 contains the primitive core of this synthesizing idea or underlying spiritual reality which is witnessed to by the koinonia language in terms of its inner content, implications and practical expressions. Here intimated in essence is a horizontal "sharing-together" in a vertical Divine reality which becomes more fully expressed in the fascinating *καὶ ἡ κοινῳνία δὲ ἡ ἡμετέρα μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* of I John 1:3. That this core idea

affords the focal point for the correct appreciation of the terminology is evident when it is recalled (1) that the vertical reference of the language is several times in the realm of the salvation-reality of God resident in Christ through the Holy Spirit, (2) that in these instances the corporate aspect is present in greater and lesser degrees, and (3) that in the majority of those uses on the purely horizontal plane the vertical relation is usually implicit and assumed if not explicit in the context (cf. Rom. 15:26-27). For the most part the language centers around an actual or "ought-to-be" special and unique relationship between men which subsists and exists in a "sharing-together" in Divine grace. The two dimensions are inseparable: "The vertical is the origin of the horizontal, while the outward expression of the horizontal is at the same time the sign and pledge of the reality of the vertical."<sup>1</sup> Though the emphasis vacillates in the New Testament from one dimension to the other, it can be safely maintained that the overall interest and intention of the writers in their more significant uses of the koinonia language rests in the "joint partaking of grace" for their lives together for Christ and the Gospel's sake. Thus the focal or synthesizing idea could be narrowed to and precisely defined as a "sharing-together" viewed as a distinct "quality of life." This is the nature of the koinonia concept in the New Testament, not quite fully expressed in any one passage, but implied in the majority of them. The idea is expressed in many other ways throughout the New Testament, but no one term is so fitted to reach the heart of it as is koinonia.

The manner in which koinonia and cognates bear their witness to

---

<sup>1</sup>Cranfield, p. 82.



that pervading spiritual reality which underlies them is varied and leads into many aspects of New Testament thought. This witness can be considered as threefold. First there are those passages which express in differing ways the vertical ground of "the sharing-together." It is designated as grace (Phil. 1:7), the Gospel (Phil. 1:5; I Cor. 9:23; cf. Philem. 17; Rom. 15:27, 11:17), faith (Philem. 6), the Holy Spirit (II Cor. 13:13; Phil. 2:1; Acts 2:42), Christ and/or God (I Cor. 1:9; I John 1:3, 6), the divine nature (II Peter 1:4), the body and blood of Christ (I Cor. 10:16), the sufferings of Christ (Phil. 3:10; II Cor. 1:7; I Peter 4:13; Rev. 1:9; cf. Phil. 1:7; 4:14) and the kingdom (Rev. 1:9; cf. I Peter 5:1). Second, there are those references which testify to the horizontal relationship between men thus grounded, but which are not necessarily exclusive of those just cited. Some appear to speak of "the sharing-together" as such (Acts 2:42; I John 1:3, 7; cf. I Cor. 1:9; 10:16; II Cor. 13:13; Phil. 2:1) while others represent some specific aspect or working out of it. Thus the language witnesses to a sharing-together in terms of the work of the Gospel (Gal. 2:9; II Cor. 8:23; Phil. 1:4-7; Philem. 17), a sharing-together in the realm of suffering (Phil. 1:7, 4:14; II Cor. 1:7; Heb. 10:33; Rev. 1:9; cf. Phil. 3:10; I Peter 4:13), a sharing-together in the sense of concrete aid to fellow Christians (Rom. 12:13; Gal. 6:6; Phil. 4:15; I Tim. 6:18; Heb. 13:16) and to the latter as applied to Paul's particular project--the offering for the poor in Jerusalem (Rom. 15:26-27; II Cor. 8:4, 9:13). A third manner in which the language is used is not quite so integral to the above postulated synthesizing idea, yet it does bear its own peculiar witness. This is a negative description, warning against any sharing-together with unbelievers (II Cor. 6:14), in the unfruitful works of

darkness (Eph. 5:10), in another man's sins (I Tim. 5:22), in the wicked work of a heretic by affording him hospitality (II John 11) and in the sins of Babylon the great (Rev. 18:5). It is in this category that the passage in I Corinthians 10:14-22 primarily belongs with its potent polemic against idolatry demonstrating the link between this third range of ideas and the central concept. The only occurrences of the koinonia terminology which have not been viewed as witnessing in some way to the synthesizing idea represented by the language are Matthew 23:30,<sup>1</sup> Luke 5:10 and Hebrews 2:14. The context of the latter is the Incarnation rather than a realized salvation.

As to the question of any development of the terminology within the New Testament, there is without a doubt a distinction between the three basic areas of its usage--the Acts of the Apostles, Paul and I John. The occurrences of the language in Hebrews and the Petrine literature having close affinity to the Pauline use are not distinctive enough to form a separate category. But how about the continuity of terminological usage within the three? A preliminary observation will suffice at this point. The distinction between them is not primarily one of their view of the language as such, but more in their manner of interpretation or expression of the reality for which they utilize the koinonia language. Although there is a striking continuity in the reality for which each of the three use the terminology in their most important occurrences, there is little evidence to suppose that any one was dependent on the other's use, or that there may have been a common special early church-wide use of the words in this way. The above phenom-

---

<sup>1</sup>This could possibly be fitted into the third group.

ena can in the main be accounted for by what has already been termed the unique usefulness of the koinonia language with its capacity for dual-dimensional reference. Each writer pulled the word(s) out of the common stock because he found it peculiarly useful to express the ideas which he was attempting to put over. Each took the word and filled it with his own content of meaning which is coincidentally similar due to that same great salvation-reality which occupied them all. The development then is more in concept than in terminology.

108/



## PART TWO: THE RELIGIOUS BACKGROUND

### CHAPTER III

#### ANTICIPATIONS OF KOINONIA APART FROM THE NEW TESTAMENT REVELATION

Now that the specific nature of the concept of koinonia in the New Testament has been defined, it will be in order briefly to sketch the general religious background against which it can be more clearly seen. Taking koinonia primarily as a "sharing-together" perceived as a distinct quality of life it is the task of this chapter to trace the anticipations of the New Testament idea in pagan religion and thought in Old Testament religion and social conceptions and in contemporary Judaism.

#### Pagan Religion and Thought

Since the concern at this point is primarily with Greek language sources, the treatment will be limited as much as is practical to the ideas portrayed by the employment of the koinonia terminology. As there is no direct religious continuity, as for example between the Old Testament or contemporary Judaism and the New Testament, this method is sufficient for the limited scope of this section.

Many of the areas and uses of the language in Greek writers have already been mentioned in Chapter I so only that which is most pertinent will be duplicated here. The most prevalent general concept designated by koinonia is that of the relationship between men in various common

spheres of life. A typical illustration is Aristotle Ethica Nicomachea VIII 10, 4: "The relationship of father to sons (ἡ μὲν γὰρ πατρὸς πρὸς υἱεῖς κοινωρία) is regal in type, since a father's first care is for his children."<sup>1</sup> This thought is particularly applied to the marriage relationship<sup>2</sup> and can refer to everything from the total sharing of life<sup>3</sup> involved therein to the sexual act itself.<sup>4</sup> Another common usage is in business relationships<sup>5</sup> where koinonos is a technical term for business partner.<sup>6</sup>

In a similar vein is the thought of friendship as the highest expression of koinonia when the latter is viewed in terms of a quality of relationship between men. Integral to this is a readiness to share goods and property. Aristotle gives voice to this when he says in Ethica Nicomachea VIII 9, 1: καὶ ἡ παροικία 'κοινὰ τὰ φίλων' ὁρθῶς ἐν κοινωρίᾳ γὰρ ἡ φιλία.<sup>7</sup> The expression of this con-

<sup>1</sup>H. Rackham, (Loeb (1926-1934), p. 493./ Cf. Aristotle Ethica Nicomachea VIII 9, 4-6; Plato Leges IX 861 E; Philo Decalogue 132; Epictetus Fragmenta 1.

<sup>2</sup>Philo De Specialibus Legibus I 109. See above pp. 20f. for actual quotations and other citations.

<sup>3</sup>Isocrates III 40.

<sup>4</sup>Aristotle Politica VII 14, 1; Euripides Bacchae 1276; Philo De Abrahamo 100.

<sup>5</sup>Plato Respublica I 343 D; Aristotle Politica II 2, 9; J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1930), p. 351.

<sup>6</sup>Hauck, p. 799; The Amherst Papyri 100, 4; B.G.U. IV 1123, 14.

<sup>7</sup>Cf. the whole paragraph VIII 9, 1-3; VIII 12, 1; Hauck, p. 799; Ioannes ab Arnim, Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta (Lipsiae: In Aedibus B. G. Teubneri, 1903), III, 27, 3: φιλία δ' εἶναι κοινωρίαν βίου; Plato Respublica IV 424.

cept can be traced back to Pythagoras, for it is reported on the authority of the historian Timaeus that he was the first to say κοινὰ τὰ φίλων εἶναι καὶ φιλιὰν ἰσότητα.<sup>1</sup> Pythagoras was the founder of a religious community in southern Italy during the second half of the sixth century B.C.<sup>2</sup> He taught and practised a community of goods and common life with his disciples according to the ideal pattern which he believed reigned among the gods.<sup>3</sup> Friendship was the prime category,<sup>4</sup> but Iamblichus did not hesitate to describe it also as koinonia: "For all things (with his disciples) were common and the same to all, and no one possessed anything private. And he indeed who approved of this communion (τῇ κοινωρίᾳ), used common possessions in the most just manner."<sup>5</sup>

Most certainly influenced by the beliefs and practices of the Pythagoreans are the ideals of Plato at this point.<sup>6</sup> The Pythagorean

<sup>1</sup>Diogenes Laertius Pythagorae VIII 10: εἰπέτε ἡρώτος, ὥς φησι Τίμαιος, κοινὰ . . . ἰσότητα.

<sup>2</sup>Frederick Copleston, Greece and Rome, Vol. I of A History of Philosophy (Burns Oates and Washbourne Ltd., Publishers to the Holy See, 1946), p. 29. He sees an influence on Pythagoras of similar Orphic practices and beliefs. Iamblichus' Life of Pythagoras, tr. Thomas Taylor (London: T. Taylor, 1818), c. V, pp. 17ff., c. XXV, p. 182.

<sup>3</sup>Iamblichus, c. XVI, pp. 49-50, c. XXXIV, p. 170. Hauck, pp. 792f.

<sup>4</sup>Iamblichus, c. XVI, p. 170; c. VI pp. 20-21; c. XIX, p. 68. The last two appeal to κοινὰ τὰ φίλων. The Greek text used is Iamblichi Chalcidensis, De Vita Pythagorae, ed. Iohanne Arcerio Theodoreto (In Bibliopolio Commeliniana, 1598).

<sup>5</sup>Iamblichus, pp. 122f.

<sup>6</sup>Copleston, p. 129.



proverb κοινὰ τὰ φίλων occurs several times in his writings<sup>1</sup> and the thought there embodied played a definitive role in the concept or set of ideals which furnishes the context for his most significant use of koinonia. Like the Pythagoreans Plato grounds his practical ideals in his belief as to the nature of the entire cosmos. In Gorgias 507 E - 508 E, having commented that "where there is no communion (κοινωνία), there can be no friendship (φιλία)"<sup>2</sup> he continues with:

And wise men tell us, Callicles, that heaven and earth and gods and men are held together by communion and friendship (τὴν κοινωνίαν συνεχεῖν καὶ φιλίαν), by orderliness, temperance, and justice; and that is the reason, my friend, why they call the whole of this world by the name of order (κόσμον), not of disorder (ἀκοσμίαν) or dissoluteness.<sup>3</sup>

This universal harmony Plato attempts to work out in an ideal state,<sup>4</sup> the relationship between whose citizens he can describe in terms of koinonia:

And the city whose state is most like that of an individual man. For example, if the finger of one of us is wounded, the entire community of bodily connections (πᾶσα ἡ κοινωνικὴ ἢ κατὰ τὸ σῶμα) stretching to the soul for 'integration' with the dominant part is made aware.<sup>5</sup>

For the two highest classes, the Guardians (φύλακες) and the Auxiliaries (ἐπικούροι)<sup>6</sup> was prescribed not only a community of property<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Plato Leges 739 C; Respublica IV 424 A.

<sup>2</sup>W. R. M. Lamb, Loeb (1925), pp. 469-471.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Plato's Respublica, Politicus and Leges.

<sup>5</sup>Plato Respublica V 462 C, translated by Paul Shorey, Loeb (1946), p. 471. Cf. 462 B, 464 A.

<sup>6</sup>Plato Respublica III 412 C - 413 C; 414 B.

<sup>7</sup>Plato Respublica III 416 D - 417 A; V 464 C - E.

but also of wives and children in which "no parent shall know its own offspring nor any child its parent."<sup>1</sup> Plato consistently designates this as ἡ κοινωμία τῶν τε παίδων καὶ τῶν γυναικῶν .<sup>2</sup> And finally he terms this whole manner of life ταύτην τὴν κοινω-  
νίαν .<sup>3</sup>

Aristotle, (a late contemporary of Plato and member of the Acad-  
emy), while much more realistic about the wisdom of a thorough-going  
community of goods, wives and children, did not hesitate to say that  
ἡ γὰρ πολιτεία κοινωμία τίς ἐστι <sup>4</sup> and spoke often in terms of  
τῆς κοινωμίας τῆς πολιτικῆς .<sup>5</sup> The state was for him more  
precisely a κοινωμία πολιτῶν πολιτείας <sup>6</sup> or ἡ γενῶν καὶ  
κωμῶν κοινωμία βῶης τελείας καὶ αὐτάρκους,

which in our view constitutes a happy and noble life; the political  
fellowship (τὴν πολιτικὴν κοινωνίαν ) must therefore be  
deemed to exist for the sake of noble actions, not merely for liv-  
ing in common. Hence those who contribute most to such a fellow-  
ship (εἰς τὴν τοιαύτην κοινωνίαν ) have a larger share  
in the state than those who are their equals or superiors in free-  
dom or birth, but not their equals in civic virtue, or than those  
who surpass them in wealth but are surpassed by them in virtue.<sup>7</sup>

In criticizing Plato, Aristotle designated the former's system as τὴν

<sup>1</sup>Plato Respublica V 457 C - D, translated by Paul Shorey, pp. 453-454. Concerning the Guardians cf. V 450 C, 461 E, 404 A, and for the Auxiliaries V 464 B.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Plato Respublica V 449 D, 450 C, 461 E, 464 A, 464 B. In Leges 739 C he can express the same idea with κοινά .

<sup>3</sup>Plato Respublica V 466 D.

<sup>4</sup>Aristotle Politica II 1, 2.

<sup>5</sup>Aristotle Politica II 1, 1; II 1, 6; III 1, 13.

<sup>6</sup>Aristotle Politica III 1, 13.

<sup>7</sup>Aristotle Politica III 5, 14-15, translated by H. Rackham, Loeb (1932), p. 219.

κοινωρίαι<sup>1</sup>, but when referring to the specific phase of the community of wives and children it was as often with κοινός<sup>2</sup> as with κοινωρία<sup>3</sup>.

Among the Cynics the common proverb was applied with critical motives in an idealistic manner:

All things belong to the gods. The gods are friends to the wise, and friends share all property in common (κοινὰ δὲ τὰ τῶν φίλων); therefore all things are the property of the wise.<sup>4</sup>

As with Plato, the community of wives and children (κοινὰς εἶναι δειρ τὰς γυναῖκας)<sup>5</sup> was involved. The "only true commonwealth (ὁρθὴν πολιτείαν) was . . . that which is as wide as the universe (εἶναι τὴν ἐν κόσμῳ)." <sup>6</sup>

In the thought of the Stoics, whose founder Zeno was influenced by the Cynics, koinonia took on a very comprehensive and all-pervasive form. The world (κόσμος) was their state (πόλις).<sup>7</sup> The life principle which allows the universe its condition of koinonia<sup>8</sup> is reason (λόγος).<sup>9</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Aristotle Politica II 1, 14; II 2, 12-14.

<sup>2</sup>Aristotle Politica II 1, 15; II 2, 11; II 2, 14; II 1, 13.

<sup>3</sup>Aristotle Politica II 1, 18; II 3, 1; II 3, 2.

<sup>4</sup>Diogenes Laertius VI, Diogenes 72, translated by R. D. Hicks, Loeb (1925), p. 73.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 75. Cf. Hauck, p. 795, for a fuller and yet concise presentation and documentation of their views in this regard.

<sup>7</sup>Marcus Aurelius Antoninus IV, 4: ὁ κόσμος ὡσαύτῃ πόλις ἔστί

<sup>8</sup>Dio Chrysostom XL 35-39, twice applies the term koinonia to the relation between the elements in the universe.

<sup>9</sup>Marcus Aurelius Antoninus IV 4. Diogenes Laertius VII 138-139: "The world, in their view, is ordered by reason (νοῦς) and



This law of nature<sup>1</sup> shared alike by gods<sup>2</sup> and men is the essence of koinonia.<sup>3</sup> Thus the Stoics can speak in terms of τὴν θεῶν ἡρὸς ἀλλήλους κοινωρίαν,<sup>4</sup> κοινωρεῖν μόνον ταῦτα πέφυκεν τῷ θεῷ τῆς συναρastroφῆς κατὰ τὸν λόγον ἐκικηπλεγμένα<sup>5</sup> and that men were made ἡρὸς κοινωρίαν.<sup>6</sup> This resultant

providence (πρόνοια) . . . . -- inasmuch as reason pervades every part of it, just as the soul (ψυχῆς) does in us. Only there is a difference of degree; in some parts there is more of it, in others less. . . . Thus, then, the whole world is a living being, (endowed with soul and reason (τὸν ὅλον κόσμον ζῶντα καὶ ἐμψυχον καὶ λογικόν), and having aether for its ruling principle." Translation by R. D. Hicks, Loeb (1925), p. 243.

<sup>1</sup>Robert von Pöhlmann, Geschichte der sozialen Frage und der Sozialismus in der antiken Welt (2nd ed.; München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1912), II, 342, writes of the Stoic social philosophy; "Das Gesetz der Natur, welches zugleich das der Vernunft und daher für alle vernunftbegabten Wesen ein und dasselbe ist, verbindet dieselben zu einer idealen Einheit, indem es ihnen allen dieselben sittlichen Ziele steckt. Jeder einzelne hat sich daher als Teil eines grossen, innerlich zusammengehörigen Ganzen, als Glied einer Gemeinschaft zu fühlen. Der Trieb nach Gemeinschaft ist allen Vernunftwesen geradezu eingeboren, sie ist ein Gebot der Natur."

<sup>2</sup>Dio Chrysostom XXXVI 23. Cf. Rudolf Bultmann, Primitive Christianity in Its Contemporary Setting, tr. R. H. Fuller (Edinburgh: Collins, The Fontana Library, 1956-1960), pp. 161-164.

<sup>3</sup>Marcus Aurelius Antoninus IV 4: Εἰ τὸ νοερόν ἡμῶν κοινόν, καὶ ὁ λόγος, καθ' ὃν λογικός ἐσμεν, κοινός. εἰ τοῦτο καὶ ὁ προστακτικός τῶν ποιετέων ἢ μὴ λόγος κοινός. εἰ τοῦτο, καὶ ὁ νόμος κοινός. εἰ τοῦτο, πολῖται ἐσμεν. εἰ τοῦτο, πολιτεύματος τινος μετέχομεν. εἰ τοῦτο, ὁ κόσμος ὡσαυτεῖ πόλις ἐστὶ. τίνος γὰρ ἄλλου φήσει τις τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων πᾶν γένος κοινού πολιτεύματος μετέχειν; ἐκείθεν δὲ, ἐκ τῆς κοινῆς ταύτης πόλεως, καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ νοερόν καὶ λογικὸν καὶ νομικὸν ἡμῶν.

<sup>4</sup>Dio Chrysostom XXXVI 23, Marcus Aurelius Antoninus IX 8, 4, Epictetus II 19, 27: ἡρὸς κοινωρίας.

<sup>5</sup>Epictetus I 9, 5. Cf. Adolf Bonhöffer, Epiktet und das Neue

koinonia among men was not to be worked out on the plane of an applied political theory, but took on more of the nature of a quality of relationship between them--a matter first of all of spirit.<sup>1</sup> This would be perfected and come near to a *κόσμου νομῆς* in which the will of god reigned unchallenged as mankind more and more was penetrated by the *λόγος*.<sup>2</sup>

Similar ideas to those sketched above found expression from time to time in the more fictional or romantic vein of Greek literature.<sup>3</sup> Hesiod pictured the Golden Age,<sup>4</sup> Plato described his mythical Atlantis,<sup>5</sup> Aristophanes dwelt occasionally on a communistic ideal<sup>6</sup> and others told of Utopian societies.<sup>7</sup>

A particular religious area in which the koinonia language is often employed is that of the sacramental. The primitive conception was that one could partake of mysterious divine power (*mana*) through eating and drinking. This developed in the later cult to the idea of a commu-

---

Testament (Giessen: Verlag von Alfred Töplemann, 1911), pp. 51f. (n)

<sup>6</sup>Marcus Aurelius Antoninus VI 6. Epictetus Fragmenta 1.

<sup>1</sup>Pöhlmann, p. 344.

<sup>2</sup>Bonhöffer, p. 377. Pöhlmann, p. 346: "Die *κοινωνία* der älteren Staatesideale soll sich zu einer allseitigen Gemeinschaft des ganzen Menschengeschlechtes erweitern, der eine Menschheitsstaat zugleich der Sozialstaat der Zukunft sein." For this whole section cf. pp. 340-348.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. the discussion in Pöhlmann, II, 348-411, and Hauck, p. 794.

<sup>4</sup>Hesiod Opera et Dies, pp. 109 ff.

<sup>5</sup>Plato Critias.

<sup>6</sup>Aristophanes Ecclesiazusae 589ff., 608ff., 690ff.

<sup>7</sup>Cf. Diodorus Siculus II 47-60, V 45.

nion of deity with men surrounding an offering.<sup>1</sup> This sacrifice appears in Homer as a sacred feast in which the gods take part and by which their favour is gained.<sup>2</sup> Often those who are to take part in the sacrificial meal are termed koinonoi,<sup>3</sup> that is, of each other and the gods. Plato can speak of the sacrifices and ceremonies as *ἡ περὶ Θεοῦς τὲ καὶ ἀνθρώπων πρὸς ἀλλήλους κοινωνία*.<sup>4</sup> These ideas are likewise to be found in Hellenistic times where the gods are conceived of as inviting men to the sacred meal<sup>5</sup> at which they are *πρὸς ἀλλήλους συνγένειαν καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν κοινωνίαν . . . πρὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ*.<sup>6</sup> Similarly the god is portrayed as the host at the feast:

καὶ θυσιῶν μόνῳ τούτῳ θεῷ διαφερόντως  
κοινωνοῦσιν ἄνθρωποι τὴν ἀκριβὴ κοινωνίαν  
καλοῦντες τὴν ἐφ' ἐστίαν καὶ προῖσταμενοι  
δαιτυμόνα αὐτὸν καὶ ἐστιατόρα . . .  
παραπλησία δὲ καὶ ἡ κατὰ τὰ ἄλλα πρὸς

<sup>1</sup>Hauck, p. 799. Cf. Pauly W XI (1922) 2171f.

<sup>2</sup>Homer *Odyssea* III 43-66, VIII 76, The *Ilias* I 53-67, IX 535. J. Wight Duff, "Communion with Deity (Greek and Roman)," *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, ed. James Hastings (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1910), III, 763-771.

<sup>3</sup>Euripides *Electra* 637: ὅθεν ὦ ἱδῶν σε δαίτι κοινωνῶν καλεῖ . . . *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum* 1106, 6f.: ἐκ[ι]μ[ε]λέσθων [δ]ι[ε] αὐτῶν πρὸς τῶν ἱερῶν κοινωνεῦντες . Cf. Demosthenes 19, 280.

<sup>4</sup>Plato *Symposium* 188 B: ἐτι τοίνυν καὶ αἱ θυσίαι πᾶσαι καὶ οἱς μαγικὴ ἐπιστάται—ταῦτα δ' ἐστὶν ἡ περὶ Θεοῦς τε καὶ ἀνθρώπων πρὸς ἀλλήλους κοινωνία—οὐ περὶ ἄλλο τι ἐστὶν ἢ περὶ Ἑρωτος φυλακῆν τε καὶ ἴασιν.

<sup>5</sup>The *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* I 110 (2nd cent.): Ἑρωτᾶ σε χαίρημων δειπνήσαι εἰς κλείνην τοῦ κυρίου Σαραπίδος ἐν τῷ Σαραπίῳ αὐρίον Cf. III 523.

<sup>6</sup>*Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*, ed. L. Robert (Lugduni Batavorum: Apud A. W. Sijthoff, 1929), IV, 247. Cf. 250, 251, a, 255. Seesemann, pp. 54, 102.



αὐτὸν κοινωνία δμότιμος.<sup>1</sup>

ony  
The whole phenomena of the Mystery-Religions reflected by the preceding citations which sought to satisfy in that age man's desire as Anrich expresses it for "Gemeinschaft mit Gott, Teilnahme am göttlichen Leben, Genuss des Göttlichen"<sup>2</sup> affords an interesting perspective from which to view the New Testament idea of koinonia. Angus writes:

Stoicism had inculcated the idea of humanity as a mystic organism, all of the same origin and divine parentage sharing the same reason, but the Mystery-Religions limited this corporate idea and so qualified the solidarity of mankind through their exclusiveness, that is, they gave rise to a new conception of vast importance in the history of religion, the conception of a mystic exclusive supernatural society held together by sacramental bonds and drawing its life from common channels of grace, and the members of such a society were 'members one of another' rather than of the brotherhood of nature.<sup>3</sup>

This koinonia of gods and men which lay at the heart of the Mysteries and was expressed in their sacred meals had primarily an emotional basis without necessarily resulting in ethical fruit.<sup>4</sup>

Finally, Hellenistic mysticism could talk in terms somewhat reminiscent of the Stoics: *κοινωνία δὲ ἐστὶ ψυχῶν, καὶ κοινωνοῦσι μὲν αἱ τῶν θεῶν ταῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, αἱ δὲ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ταῖς τῶν ἀλόγων*.<sup>5</sup> In this scheme the high-

<sup>1</sup>Aristides, ed. G. Dindorf (Lipsiae: Libraria Weidmannia G. Reimer, 1829), I, 93f. Cf. Lietzmann, pp. 49f.

<sup>2</sup>Gustav Anrich, Das antike Mysterienwesen in seinem Einfluss auf das Christentum (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1894), p. 37.

<sup>3</sup>S. Angus, The Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World (London: John Murray, 1929), pp. 79f.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., pp. 82, 88.

<sup>5</sup>A. D. Nock and A. J. Festugiere, Corpus Hermeticum (Paris: Societé D' Edition "Les Belles Lettres," 1945), I, X, 22, p. 124.

er realm of being is responsible for the lower. God is over all and to him the *κόσμος* is subject.<sup>1</sup>

To sum up this brief excursion into Pagan religion and thought, the overall idea exhibited, apart from the ordinary relations of life, has to do with an idealistic and/or religious quality of life rooted in the realm of the divine, be that conceived of as mythological or pantheistic. Involved are both the general view of life and its expression or realization in sacramental act and religious experience. Within this broad pattern were differing applications depending whether the emphasis or motif was monastic, political, philosophical or religious. But it is in contact with the general concept and terminological use as well as in contrast to the varied particular expressions that the New Testament idea can be viewed. This is not to say that there are not many points of likeness to the concrete manifestations of the idea, rather that the main point of contact is more in the realm of the general than in the specific.

#### Old Testament Religion and Social Conceptions

Two facts render it impossible even to sketch the Old Testament background of the New Testament concept of koinonia on the basis of language relationship alone as was attempted above in respect to pagan religion and thought. First and most important is that there is a direct revelational and religious<sup>2</sup> continuity between the two Testaments: thus the background in the Old of any particular idea in the New could hardly

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid.

<sup>2</sup>The German "heilsgeschichtlich" would express more succinctly what is intended by "revelational and religious." c/h

be indicated merely on the basis of terminological connections. The second fact substantiates the first, for the koinonia language as traced through the LXX is very disappointing in relation to the New Testament concept.

In the few places where the terminology does occur in the LXX corresponding to the canonical Old Testament<sup>1</sup> it usually represents some form of the Hebrew root  $\text{וָּיַחַד}$ <sup>2</sup> which means basically "unite, be joined"<sup>3</sup> and is used in respect to both things (Ex. 26:6) and people (Gen. 14:3). The striking thing about the latter use of these terms in the Old Testament is that they refer almost exclusively to the relation between man and man and that very seldom in a distinctively religious context. Hosea 4:17 reads "Ephraim is joined"<sup>4</sup> to idols" (LXX  $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\chi\omicron\varsigma \epsilon\iota\delta\omega\lambda\omega\nu$  ), and Isaiah 44:11 in respect to the man who fashions idols to worship has "behold, all his fellows"<sup>5</sup> shall be put to shame (LXX - Theodotion  $\text{\textit{\text{I}}\text{d}\text{ou} \text{h}\text{a}\text{r}\text{t}\text{es} \text{o}\text{\text{I}} \text{t}\text{o}\text{i}\text{n}\text{w}\text{r}\text{o}\text{u}\text{r}\text{t}\text{es} \text{a}\text{u}\text{t}\text{\text{h}}\text{u}}$   $\text{\text{a}}\text{i}\text{o}\text{x}\text{u}\text{r}\text{\text{h}}\text{i}\text{s}\text{o}\text{r}\text{t}\text{a}\text{i}$  ). Never as has been observed above in Greek religion does the language refer directly to a man's relationship to God. And only once when the Psalmist exclaims "I am a companion"<sup>6</sup> of all who fear

17 These as well as those occurring in the rest of the LXX have all been touched upon in Chapter I in respect to their construction and basic meaning.

<sup>2</sup>The exceptions are Lev. 5:21, the only instance where the LXX renders the Old Testament by koinonia (cf. pp. 23f.), Prov. 1:11 and Ecc. 9:4. The latter has the Qere 7 7 7

<sup>3</sup>Brown, Driver and Briggs, p. 287.

4 773 77

חַבְרָה ל' י"ד 5

6  $\gamma \gamma \pi$



thee (119:63)" (LXX -μέτεχος ) can it be said to designate a relation between men based upon a common relation to God. A suggestive use is that of Malachi 2:14 where κοινωρός σου appears in apposition to the phrase γυνή διαθήκης σου (אִשְׁתִּי בְרִיתִי) even though the latter term is here applicable only to the human marriage relationship.

The most frequent context when a koinon- word represents a form of

אֲנִי is that of association with evil or evil men as in Proverbs 28:

24 (κοινωρός ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος ἀσεβούς ), Job 34:8 (κοινω-  
νήσας μετὰ ποιούντων τὰ ἀνόμια ) and Isaiah 1:23 (κοινωροί  
κλέπτων ).<sup>1</sup> This phenomenon coupled with the total absence of

koinonia in the Greek Old Testament and with the exception of the

enigmatic Leviticus 5:21 demonstrates the comparative fruitlessness of

pursuing further this particular line of approach. At the same time

this negative result is theologically important in setting Greek reli-

gious thought over against that of the Old Testament. This distinction

Hauck summarizes concisely: "Der at.liche Fromme weiss sich als אֲנִי

in einem Abhängigkeits- und Hörigkeitsverhältnis gegenüber Gott--das

sich allerdings zum Vertrauensverhältnis (vgl אֲנִי אֶת־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ) vertief-

en kann --, aber eben nicht und nie als אֲנִי Gottes."<sup>2</sup>

Since reliance cannot be placed on the linguistic connection to

sketch the Old Testament background of the New Testament concept of

koinonia it must be attempted on other bases, those of the religious and

social concepts and practices which directly anticipate the New Testa-

ment idea. It is perhaps best to define more precisely that which is

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Prov. 1:11 in the LXX and Hosea 6:9 in the Hebrew text.

<sup>2</sup>Hauck, p. 802.

sought lest this summary investigation become (and legitimately so) as broad as the Old Testament revelation itself. In Chapter II the center of the New Testament reality pointed up as koinonia was seen to be a quality of life consisting of a "sharing-together" in the Salvation of God in Jesus Christ by the Holy Spirit effecting a unique relation between men with varying concrete expressions. This was seen to have a negative aspect which bears witness to what can be termed its holy character. It is to point out the obvious anticipation of this central concept or reality with its various elements that is the aim of this section.

One must begin, however, with the broad context of the sense of solidarity which was so intense in ancient societies<sup>1</sup> and permeates the whole of the Old Testament. The Israelite thinking can be described as synthetic and characterized by what has been called the "grasping of a totality."<sup>2</sup> This awareness of totality as expressed in the Old Testament is similar to but more advanced than what Levy-Bruhl has designated as the basic principle of primitive thought, "the law of participation,"<sup>3</sup> which governs the connections between persons or objects which form part of what he calls a collective representation.<sup>4</sup> That is, like primitive<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>C. H. Dodd, p. 13.

<sup>2</sup>Aubrey R. Johnson, The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1949), p. 7.

<sup>3</sup>Lucien Levy-Bruhl, How Natives Think, tr. L. A. Clare (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1926), p. 76.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid. Cf. pp. 69-104.

<sup>5</sup>For the legitimacy or otherwise of the word "primitive" in application to Israelite thinking of Thorlief Boman, Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek, tr. Jules L. Moreau (London:

cf.

mentality, the Israelites perceived of phenomena as being for the most part in some sort of relation; they have a share in some sort of whole.<sup>1</sup> This sense of solidarity has been more precisely defined in respect to the Old Testament by H. W. Robinson as the Hebrew conception of corporate personality.<sup>2</sup> He notes that the two basic elements which are used in the definition of a corporation according to English law are involved in corporate personality: (1) a body corporate authorized to act as an individual, (2) an artificial person having the capacity of perpetual succession.<sup>3</sup> Four distinct aspects of this conception which are pertinent for the Old Testament are outlined by Robinson:

(1) the unity of its extension both into the past and into the future; (2) the characteristic "realism" of the conception, which distinguishes it from "personification", and makes the group a real entity actualized in its members; (3) the fluidity of reference, facilitating rapid and unmarked transitions from the one to the many, and from the many to the one; (4) the maintenance of the corporate idea even after the development of a new individualistic emphasis within it.<sup>4</sup>

The most applicable of these points to the matter at hand is that of its realism<sup>5</sup> concerning which Robinson goes on to say:

The Hebrew conception is neither a literary personification nor an idea. Its study does not belong to the linguistic, but to the archaeological and anthropological sides of the subject. It is an

---

S. C. M. Press, 1960) pp. 21-23.

<sup>1</sup>Johnson, p. 7.

<sup>2</sup>H. Wheeler Robinson, "The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality," Werden und Wesen des Alten Testaments, ed. J. Hempel (Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1936), pp. 49-62.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 49.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 50.

<sup>5</sup>Valuable for an understanding of this aspect is the study by A. R. Johnson, above p. 122, n. 2.



instinctive and not a consciously made unification. . . . Still further, we must note the relation of this conception of corporate personality to that of individual personality, as shown by the psychological ideas of the Hebrews. For them, the personality consisted of a number of bodily organs animated by a breath-soul and each possessing a diffused and distributed psychical and ethical quality. It is precisely the same idea which belongs to the unity of the group. The group possesses a consciousness which is distributed amongst its individual members and does not exist simply as a figure of speech or as an idea. Indeed we may generalize to the extent of saying that there is usually a close parallelism between the psychology of the individual and the conception of society which prevails in any age.<sup>1</sup>

This psychic unity in which the individual was conceived of as being a part of some whole as aptly indicated by Köhler's curt phrase, "Ein Mensch ist kein Mensch,"<sup>2</sup> can be illustrated in almost every aspect of the life of the Israelite--family, clan, tribe, nation.<sup>3</sup> Even their word for man,  $\text{אָדָם}$  (cf. Gen. 1:26; Ps. 8:5), bore witness to this conception.<sup>4</sup> But the present discussion will need to be limited to those aspects which most directly furnish the background for the New Testament idea in question.

Most vital for the present purpose is the fundamental conception of the Covenant ( $\text{בְּרִית}$ )<sup>5</sup> which is inseparably linked to the conception

<sup>1</sup>H. W. Robinson, p. 51.

<sup>2</sup>Ludwig Köhler, Theologie des Alten Testaments (2nd ed.; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr Paul Siebeck, 1947), p. 113. Cf. pp. 113-116, 148.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. R. P. Shedd, pp. 3-41, where he concisely discusses the whole conception in the Old Testament along the lines of the four aspects as outlined by H. W. Robinson. Also of value is the work by Johs. Pedersen, Israel, Its Life and Culture (London: Oxford University Press, 1926-1940), I-II, III-IV.

<sup>4</sup>Köhler, p. 113. H. W. Robinson, p. 55, acknowledges that any exhaustive view of its application "would range from the accidentance and syntax of Hebrew grammar up to the highest levels of Old Testament Theology."

<sup>5</sup>Walter Eichrodt, Theologie des Alten Testaments (Leipzig: J.

of corporate personality.<sup>1</sup> Within the bounds of the Covenant the unity was more than natural, for the idea of covenant presupposes a natural unrelatedness.<sup>2</sup> This is not to deny that there was a natural psychic unity in Israel, but rather to affirm the religious and spiritual character of their covenant unity<sup>3</sup> which was the larger frame within which their generic unity subsisted.<sup>4</sup> God in their history had uniquely called them out in Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, delivered them miraculously from Egypt and made them distinctly His people in the Covenant on Mount Sinai.<sup>5</sup> Thus they became "a religious community, linked together not only by ties of blood, but first and foremost by God."<sup>6</sup> The sense of psychic oneness or solidarity which was so realistic in Israel was

---

C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1933, 1935, 1939), 3 vols., used the covenant idea as the basis of a complete theology of the Old Testament.

<sup>1</sup>H. W. Robinson, p. 55. Cf. H. W. Robinson, "The Theology of the Old Testament," Record and Revelation, ed. H. W. Robinson (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1938), p. 332.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. the much quoted statement of W. Robertson Smith, The Religion of the Semites (Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black, 1889), p. 300: "a covenant means artificial brotherhood, and has no place where the natural brotherhood of which it is an imitation already subsists." Cf. also Pederson, I-II, 285.

<sup>3</sup>Th. C. Vriezen, An Outline of Old Testament Theology (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958), p. 140. Smith, p. 301, fn. 3.

<sup>4</sup>Shedd, p. 20.

<sup>5</sup>The Old Testament dates the Covenant back to Abraham, Gen. 15: 12-21; 17:14. For a concise statement of the origins of the Covenant and the attendant literature cf. J. O. Cobham, "Covenant," A Theological Word Book of the Bible, ed. Alan Richardson (London: S. C. M. Press, 1957), pp. 54-56. Cf. also Norman Snaith, The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament (London: The Epworth Press, 1944), pp. 107-110.

<sup>6</sup>Vriezen, p. 217.

effected by their common relation to God in the Covenant.<sup>1</sup> God in the Covenant "has come to form a communion, a circle together with Israel . . . Israel was admitted to God's sphere of life."<sup>2</sup> As G. E. Wright sums it up: "The harmony of will is not a simple agreement of a horizon-type, but a conforming of all wills to that of the Lord in a mutuality of commitment which results in a oneness of heart and life, in a psychic unity."<sup>3</sup>

A witness to this psychic unity resulting from the Covenant can be seen in another Old Testament interpretative problem, the "I" of the Psalms, which is said to be solved by the application of the concept of corporate personality.<sup>4</sup> Here, as is exemplified in Psalm 44,<sup>5</sup> there is

---

<sup>1</sup>Pedersen, III-IV, 612, observes that "the most apt expression of the relation between Yaweh and Israel is the covenant, berith. This denotes the psychic communion and the common purpose which united the people and its God. It is also expressed by saying that the peace of Yahweh reigns in Israel (shālōm, Jer. 16, 5); therefore the relation between them is characterised by love, the feeling of fellowship among kinsmen."

<sup>2</sup>Vriezen, p. 141. He defines "covenant" as follows: "The Hebrew word berith (Covenant) means something like 'bond of communion'; a covenant means as it were a circle enclosing both partners, not so much a 'limitation' (Buber) as being brought together into an intimate relationship."

<sup>3</sup>G. E. Wright, The Biblical Doctrine of Man in Society (London: S. C. M. Press, 1954), p. 48. An exposition of this from one angle is W. Eichrodt, Man in the Old Testament (London: S. C. M. Press, 1951), which finds the basis of the Old Testament view of man in the unconditional obligation of the will of God.

<sup>4</sup>H. W. Robinson, The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality, pp. 57f.

<sup>5</sup>Thou art my King and my God, who ordainest victories for Jacob.  
Through thee we push down our foes;  
through thy name we tread down our assailants.  
For not in my bow do I trust, nor can my sword save me.  
But thou has saved us from our foes,  
and hast put to confusion those who hate us. (vv. 4-7)



a fluidity of movement from the singular to the plural in which the writer, though speaking personally, yet cannot detach himself from the corporate community in their mutual relation to God. As Köhler has stressed, the Old Testament takes it for granted that man in a comprehensive manner lives in community (in einer Gemeinschaft).<sup>1</sup> For him, as over against the New Testament man, the question is not: how may I be a real and living member of the community: but: to what extent is it possible and legitimate to step out of the community?<sup>2</sup> It is at this point, a sense of solidarity effected by a common share in the saving activity of God with its resultant implications in the whole life of the people,<sup>3</sup> that the Hebrew conception of corporate personality makes its contribution to the understanding of the Old Testament background of the New Testament concept of koinonia.

On the basis of the now evident direct anticipation in the Old Testament of that which in the New Testament is sometimes described in terms of the koinonia language one can speak in this sense of the koinonia reality of the Old Testament. Several corresponding aspects of this need to be briefly noted to round out the anticipative picture. One is its expression in the cult which is said to exist "as a means to integrate the communion between God and man which God has instituted in His

---

<sup>1</sup>Köhler, p. 148.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 114. He insists that "Man kann den Satz aufstellen, dass das theologische Anliegen des AT nicht da liege, wo gefragt wird, wie es zu Gemeinschaft kommen könne, sondern da, wo gefragt, wie innerhalb der Gemeinschaft der Einzelne zu Eigenwert und Eigenverantwortung aus eigener Verantwortung heraus kommen kann." pp. 148-149.

<sup>3</sup>Pedersen, III-IV, 612.

Covenant."<sup>1</sup> The Covenant was instituted by sacrifice (Gen. 15; Ex. 24: 3-8),<sup>2</sup> and the two became inseparably linked together in Israel's theology<sup>3</sup> to the extent that the cult takes its meaning from its association with the Covenant.<sup>4</sup> Apart from the question of the several motives for and conceptions of the various offerings and sacrifices in the Old Testament all were concerned with the renewal, maintaining and purifying of the relation between God and his people.<sup>5</sup> Atoning value became ascribed to all sacrifices.<sup>6</sup> In the cult God came to man as a forgiving God affording opportunity for cleansing from sin; and in the cult man comes with his confession of guilt and his tokens of adoration.<sup>7</sup>

Pedersen points out how the more important covenants between the ancient Israelites were frequently inaugurated by a common meal which "presupposes psychic community and strengthens it still further."<sup>8</sup> As he later shows, this has a special bearing on what he considers to be the most important offering in early Israel; the one in which an animal was sacrificed, part given wholly over to God, and a common meal

---

<sup>1</sup>Vriezen, p. 280.

<sup>2</sup>W. R. Smith, pp. 300f.

<sup>3</sup>"Gather to me my faithful ones, who made a covenant with me by sacrifice." Psalm 50:5.

<sup>4</sup>Vriezen, p. 281.

<sup>5</sup>H. Wheeler Robinson, Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1946), p. 227. Pedersen remarks that "whatever the view taken of sacrifice, it always contained germs of what developed into the idea of atonement." III-IV, 359.

<sup>6</sup>C. R. North, "Sacrifice," A Theological Word Book of the Bible, ed. Alan Richardson (London: S. C. M. Press, 1957), p. 206.

<sup>7</sup>Vriezen, p. 281.

<sup>8</sup>Pedersen, I-II, 305. Cf. Gen. 31:44ff.

made of the rest in the holy place where the partakers were considered as the holy invited guests of God (Zeph. 1:7). It is these offerings, he says, that became peculiarly covenant offerings, for the Covenant with God became their chief characteristic.<sup>1</sup> This type of offering is usually designated by  $\text{לֶחֶם חֵטְאֵי}$  in the Old Testament and called "communion sacrifice" (Gemeinschaftopfer) by the moderns in distinction to the more frequent "gift sacrifices or offerings."<sup>2</sup> In it they eat together before the Lord ( $\text{לֶחֶם חֵטְאֵי לַיהוָה}$ )<sup>3</sup> concurrently creating two fellowships, that of the human participants among themselves on the one hand and that of the human participants with God on the other.<sup>4</sup> The worshippers are bound together with God in the act. The peace offering presented in Leviticus 7:11-36 (cf. Deut. 12:5-7) falls into this category.<sup>5</sup> It is not without significance that this type of offering played an integral role in the Covenant ceremony on Sinai (Ex. 24:3-11).<sup>6</sup>

The most important expression of what has been called the koinonia reality of the Old Testament for the present study due to its role in the New Testament is in that greatest of all Jewish festivals, the

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., III-IV, 334-335. According to Smith, p. 327, the fundamental idea of ancient Semitic Sacrifice is that "of communion between the god and his worshippers by joint participation in the living flesh and blood of a sacred victim." If correct the derivation of  $\text{לֶחֶם חֵטְאֵי}$  from  $\text{לָחַץ}$  "to eat" is significant. It is suggested by Gottfried Quell, " $\text{Σαθῆκη}$ ," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. Gerhard Kittel (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 193 ), II, 107f.

<sup>2</sup>Köhler, p. 171. Eichrodt, Theologie des Alten Testaments, I, 72.

<sup>3</sup>Deut. 12:7. Cf. vv. 12 and 18.

<sup>4</sup>Köhler, p. 171.

<sup>5</sup>North, p. 207.

<sup>6</sup>Eichrodt, Theologie des Alten Testaments, I, 73.



Passover (cf. Ex. 12), which is said to be representative of the whole of the Israelite cult.<sup>1</sup> Its origins are obscure,<sup>2</sup> but it gained its Old Testament significance as a memorial of the deliverance from Egypt and the subsequent Covenant with God. It is of the character of a renewal of the relationship between God and his people. The Passover lamb is at once a community-meal (peace offering) and a sin-offering (the sprinkling of blood).<sup>3</sup> Through this feast was expressed for hundreds of years in Israel's history its solidarity as a people of God.

Before looking more specifically at this sharing-together quality of life in its man-to-man dimension, a word about the exclusive implications of its religious character is necessary. The foundation as has been seen is in Israel's admission to God's sphere of life through the Covenant. God has not given up his holiness<sup>4</sup> and Israel is sanctified in relationship to him.<sup>5</sup> "You shall be holy; for I the Lord your God am holy" (Lev. 19:2), and "I am God and not man the Holy One (אֱלֹהִים וְלֹא אִישׁ) <sup>6</sup> in your midst" (Hos. 11:9), express the fundamental religious basis of Israelite morality. Thus idolatry is the chiefest of sins and demands the death penalty (Dt. 13:1-18; 17:2-7) for it strikes at the very ess-

---

<sup>1</sup>Vriezen, p. 284.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. T. H. Gaster, Passover, Its History and Traditions (New York: Henry Schuman, 1949), pp. 16-25.

<sup>3</sup>Vriezen, p. 284.

<sup>4</sup>C. F. Snaith, pp. 21-50, for an exposition of this idea in the Old Testament. Especially relevant are pp. 46-49.

<sup>5</sup>Vriezen, p. 141.

<sup>6</sup>Snaith, p. 47, translates literally, "I am El, and not man; qadosh (the adjective) in thy midst."

ence of Israel's peculiar corporate existence.<sup>1</sup> It breaks the Covenant unity. Further, sin was conceived of not merely in terms of individual responsibility<sup>2</sup> but also in terms of the well-being of the community and its relation to "the Holy One in the midst" (Lev. 17-26).<sup>3</sup> Israel's unique sharing-together or psychic unity was dependent upon their obedience to the will of the God of the Covenant (Ex. 20:1-24:3; cf. Dt. 5ff.). Sin in respect to either God or man, for they were basically inseparable, was incompatible with the nature of their corporate life. As time progressed in the history of the people of Israel this emphasis became more exclusivistic (Ezek. 40-48), particularly after the exile when Israel became a law community (Ezra; Nehemiah), as hard and fast lines were drawn between them and other peoples, and at times even among themselves.<sup>4</sup>

The positive character of the relation between men on the basis of the Covenant was intensified by the sense of corporate personality with its strong group-feeling by which all men from King to subject are brothers<sup>5</sup> and are thus in Israel equally bound to the God of the Co-

---

<sup>1</sup>Wright, p. 49, notes that the severity of this is accounted for by the nature of the Israelite community.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. H. W. Robinson, "The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality," pp. 54f., for a discussion of the relation of the later individualizing tendency to the corporate conception; and Vriezen, pp. 324-325, for the role of individual responsibility in Old Testament ethics. Cf. also Eichrodt, Theologie des Alten Testaments, III, 1-17.

<sup>3</sup>H. H. Rowley, The Faith of Israel (London: S. C. M. Press, 1956), p. 102.

<sup>4</sup>John Bright, The Kingdom of God (New York: Abingdon Cokesbury, 1953), pp. 156-186.

<sup>5</sup>H. W. Robinson, "The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality," pp. 60f. Vriezen, p. 320, would say that "in the Old Testament

venant.<sup>1</sup> Their relation to each other while strengthened in accord with the natural categories of the Semitic mind is in addition essentially spiritually qualified by their common relation to God. And as God's attitude toward them in the Covenant was  $\text{אֲהָבָה}$  (steadfast love)<sup>2</sup> so it is to characterize the relation between men within the bounds of the Covenant (Mic. 6:8).<sup>3</sup> Vriezen writes that "communal sense (chesed) is the principal moral conception" from which the demands of law ( $\text{טוֹב וְיָד}$ ) and justice ( $\text{דִּין וְצֶדֶק}$ ) spring.<sup>4</sup> These were not a matter of mere principle, but in line with the concept of Covenant the relation between man and man, like that between God and man, was personal throughout.<sup>5</sup> Men were to express  $\text{אֲהָבָה}$  in helping one another according to their ability along the line of  $\text{טוֹב וְיָד}$  and  $\text{דִּין וְצֶדֶק}$ . A realistic sharing-together in the Covenant blessings by the Old Testament man very definitely qualified the relation of man to man which was to come to ex-  


---

the central motive of moral life is the sense of community."

<sup>1</sup>Vriezen, p. 318.

<sup>2</sup>Snaith, p. 95. "Ahabah is the cause of the covenant; chesed is the means of its continuance. Thus ahabah is God's Election-Love, whilst chesed is His Covenant-Love."

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Lev. 19:17-18 which follows a series of social commandments: "You shall not hate your brother in your heart . . . but you shall love ( $\text{אָהַבְתָּ}$ ) your neighbor as yourself: I am the LORD." Pedersen, I-II, pp. 309f., does not take the "I am the LORD" sufficiently into account when he says that "the basis of all Israelitic ethos is the common feeling, love, and according to the nature of the compact it must, in its innermost essence, be a family feeling. . . . In love the soul acts in accordance with its nature. . . . The commandment to love is thus not a dogmatic invention, but a direct expression of the character of the soul and the organism of family and people."

<sup>4</sup>Vriezen, p. 326.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid.



ssion in a concrete fashion. But even at its best the result was not the recognition of social equality (only complete equivalence as a human being) and the removal of poverty (only provisions for its alleviation) as exhibited for a time in the early church (Acts 2-4).<sup>1</sup>

As much a part of the background sketch as the positive picture just drawn is the progressive failure of the people of Israel actually to realize the Covenant ideal as their history moved on. For as evidenced by the classical prophets beginning with Amos there arose a great lack of the Covenant  $\tau\omicron\pi$  in respect both to God and man. Amos attacks them for their disregard of the proper sense of Covenant community in their injustice to their brother Israelite.<sup>2</sup> Hosea was not hesitant to point out their betrayal of the very basis of the Covenant unity by their harlotrous idolotry.<sup>3</sup> The outer community was there, but they had sinned away what has been designated their koinonia quality of life. A distinctive part of the Covenant idea, differing from the surrounding religions, was that God who existed apart from Israel before he chose them in the Covenant could reject them if they neglected their part of the Covenant and exist apart from them again.<sup>4</sup> Although many of

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 328. Cf. C. Van Leeuwen, Le Développement du Sens Social en Israël Avant L'Ere Chretienne, Studia Semitica Neerlandica (Assen: Van Gorcum and Comp. N. V., 1955).

<sup>2</sup>"Oh you who turn justice to wormwood, and cast down righteousness to the earth!" Amos 5:7. Cf. 5:10-12; 2:6-16; 8:4-10.

<sup>3</sup>"My people inquire of a thing of wood,  
and their staff gives them oracles.  
For a spirit of harlotry has led them astray,  
and they have left their God to play the Harlot."  
Hosea 4:12. Cf. 4:13-19; 2:1-13.

<sup>4</sup>Snaith, p. 108. "The great barrier to religious progress was the belief that a god could not exist without a people, and that he must in the last resort rescue his people . . . if he

the people did not fully realize this, it was integral to the message of the prophets, and they did not shrink from exploiting its implications (Am. 4:11-12; Hos. 9:16-17; Is. 49:14).

Out of the people's failure arose not only separatist groups with their own peculiar sense of community as the Rechabites (Jer. 35)<sup>1</sup> but more important a transformation of the nation's hope at the hands of the prophets. On the basis of their faith in God Israel had always believed that "the best is yet to be."<sup>2</sup> They had looked forward to a great day of salvation when God would destroy all their enemies (Ps. 2, 20, 21, 72, 110) and bring Israel to its full glory after the pattern of the ideal age of David. This "day of the Lord" as it became known (Am. 5:18) was portrayed by the prophets as more than merely political but also as a day of moral judgement on all men whose lives were offensive to God (Is. 2:6ff.; Zeph. 2).<sup>3</sup> The destruction of the naive expectation of the people gave strength to the idea of a faithful remnant who at once are the people of God and the instrument of their restoration (Is. 7:3; 10:22; 37:30-32).<sup>4</sup> Over this remnant that shall one day come to fruition shall rule a Messiah Prince of the line of David (Is. 9:1-7; 11:1-5; cf. Mic. 5:2-4) and visions of a blissful future of universal and cosmic scope emerge (Is. 2:2-4; 11:6-10). Thus Isaiah may be called

---

himself was to continue to exist."

<sup>1</sup>H. W. Robinson, "The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality," p. 54.

<sup>2</sup>Rowley, p. 177.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 178.

<sup>4</sup>Rowley, p. 118. Bright, pp. 71-97.

"the first preacher of the eschatological expectation--he is clearly concerned with the 'last things'."<sup>1</sup>

The prophets have not forgotten the Covenant but have based their message of coming judgement (Am. 3:12) and hope of a New Israel upon it. Jeremiah could prophesy of a New Covenant (for Israel, not God, had broken the old) which would restore the inner relationship and create a spiritual Israel (Jer. 31:31-34; cf. Ezek. 36:25-30). Ezekiel saw a vision of the same truth when he beheld the valley of dry bones live and stand upon their feet an exceeding great host as the breath of the spirit came into them (34:1-14).

The calamity of the exile sharpened and spiritualized the prophetic hope for Israel to the height it reaches in Isaiah 40-66. Vriezen would say: "The Kingdom of God is not only seen coming in visions but it is experienced as coming."<sup>2</sup> The pinnacle is reached in the figure of the suffering servant (42:1-4; 49:1-6; 50:4-9; 52:13-53:12; cf. 61:1-3) who is Israel (41:8; 43:10; 44:21; 45:4), the righteous remnant or true Israel (44:1; 51:1, 7) and the great Servant who will be the leader of a Servant people--all in one.<sup>3</sup> The revitalized Covenant (55:3-5) which is conceived of as about to take place in great eschatological drama (66:7-9; cf. 42:14-16; 63:1-6; 49:26; 50:2-3; 51:6) with universal and cosmic results (51:3; 65:17-25) is to be accomplished by

---

<sup>1</sup>Vriezen, p. 360.

<sup>2</sup>Vriezen, p. 368.

<sup>3</sup>Bright, pp. 150f. The fluidity of the concept is accounted for by the larger concept of corporate personality. Cf. H. W. Robinson, "The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality," pp. 58-60. For critical treatments of the Servant Songs cf. H. H. Rowley, The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays (London: Lutterworth Press, 1952), pp. 3-57, and C. R. North, The Suffer-



the Servant mission and destiny. Encompassed are all nations (49:5-6; 52:10; 56:8; 60:1-3) and the organ of ultimate victory is humiliation, rejection of men and vicarious suffering (52:13-53:12). In Vriezen's words "the new world which Deutero-Isaiah predicts for his people, and therefore for all the nations, is characterized by this atoning suffering"<sup>1</sup> for from it alone can come the necessary inward renewal.

That the covenant-hope is pointed up in a Messianic figure, though it oscillates between nation and remnant, need be no more than mentioned at this stage.<sup>2</sup> More pertinent for the moment in the idyllic portrayal of the Golden Age is the Utopian<sup>3</sup> fulfillment of that sharing-together quality of life seen in the initial Covenant. So ideal are the conditions that men

. . . shall not build and another inhabit;  
they shall not plant and another eat (Is. 65:22),

God will be able to say

Before they call I will answer,  
while they are yet speaking I will hear (Is. 65:24)

and even

The wolf and the lamb shall feed together,  
the lion shall eat straw like the ox;

---

ing Servant in Deutero-Isaiah (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1948).

<sup>1</sup>Vriezen, p. 364.

<sup>2</sup>Rowley, Faith of Israel, pp. 187-191. Cf. Sigmund Mowinkel, He That Cometh, tr. G. W. Anderson (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, (1959), Part I, and Joseph Klausner, The Messianic Idea in Israel, tr. W. F. Stinespring (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1954), Part I.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Pöhlmann, pp. 587-591 who discusses this as well as the general prophetic attitude from the standpoint of socialistic concepts in the ancient world. Cf. Van Leeuwen, pp. 212-229, "Le Messie et les pauvres."

and dust shall be the serpent's food.  
They shall not hurt or destroy in all my holy mountain,  
says the LORD (Is. 65:25).

When all the strands are tied together the picture is nothing less than social equality in Israel, economic bliss, universal righteousness and peace and God in the midst.

Israel could not bear the bright light of the Servant<sup>1</sup> and so failed to respond to it. The apocalyptic note already struck in the prophecies<sup>2</sup> of Isaiah (cf. Ezek. 38-39) continues to have a place in the later prophets. For due to the disappointment following the exile when their hope that the kingdom was about to be set up among the faithful remnant (cf. Hag. 2:21-23; Zech. 6:12-13) was not realized, their expectation began to take on a more transcendental character. The only hope now was catastrophic intervention of God preceded by the most indescribable woes on earth and in heaven. An early<sup>3</sup> expression of this is Joel 2:28-31:

And it shall come to pass afterward,  
that I will pour out my spirit on all flesh;  
your sons and your daughters shall prophesy,  
your old men shall dream dreams,  
and your young men shall see visions.

---

<sup>1</sup>The idea did not disappear entirely as witnessed by a few texts in the Apocalyptic literature. Cf. Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, p. 56, Mowinkel, pp. 325ff. F. F. Bruce, Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts (London: The Tyndale Press, 1960), pp. 56-66, finds the concept in the Dead Sea Scrolls. c/

<sup>2</sup>That apocalyptic has its roots in prophecy is not disputed. Cf. H. H. Rowley, The Relevance of Apocalyptic (revised ed.; New York: Harper and Brothers, 1946), p. 13.

<sup>3</sup>Joel is most probably early post-exilic but possibly earlier. In any case its atmosphere and ideas are typical of the stage of transition from prophecy to apocalyptic. Cf. G. W. Anderson, A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament (London: Gerald Duckworth and Co. Ltd., 1959), pp. 146f.

Even upon the menservants and maidservants  
in those days, I will pour out my spirit.

And I will give portents in the heavens and on the earth, blood and fire and columns of smoke. The sun shall be turned to darkness, and the moon to blood, before the great and terrible day of the LORD comes (cf. 2:32-3:21; Zech. 14:1-3).

But whatever form it took, Israel remained convinced that "he is a God whose Kingdom comes"<sup>1</sup> (Mal. 3:6-13). Their hope for the future now "was born from faith alone."<sup>2</sup>

This leads full into the apocalyptic proper which in part has its roots in the Old Testament Daniel. Although most of it falls outside of the Old Testament it will be touched here for only a brief description of the character of its transmission of the Old Testament hope is needed.<sup>3</sup> The relevant figure in Daniel is "one like a son of man (7:13)" to whom is given "everlasting dominion (7:14)" over the eschatological kingdom. Primarily the thought is collective--"the saints of the Most High shall receive the kingdom (7:18); cf. vs. 22)"--but may possibly be individual as well.<sup>4</sup> The figure appears at a late period in the book of Enoch and IV Ezra<sup>5</sup> as definitely an individual Messianic

---

<sup>1</sup>Bright, p. 169.

<sup>2</sup>Vriezen, p. 371.

<sup>3</sup>For the messianic ideas in this literature cf. especially Klausner, pp. 246-387, Part II "The Messianic Idea in the Books of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha."

<sup>4</sup>Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, pp. 139f. Cf. H. H. Rowley, The Relevance of Apocalyptic, pp. 28f., Mowinkel, pp. 346ff., Rudolf Otto, The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man, tr. F. V. Filson and B. L. Woolf (London: The Lutterworth Press, 1938), pp. 159ff. For a recent discussion of the vast literature pertinent to this topic cf. A. J. B. Higgins, "Son of Man--Forschung since 'The Teaching of Jesus'," New Testament Essays, Studies in Memory of Thomas Walter Manson, ed. A. J. B. Higgins (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959),



figure,<sup>1</sup> who as the heavenly man will bring in the eschatological kingdom.

The Messianic concept is pointed up in different figures in this literature<sup>2</sup> which cannot be traced here. Most important is the recognition that in general the emphasis was on the complete incompatibility of this world over against the new world which can be brought in only by God's initiation through the Messianic figure(s) in the new age. There is a break in both place and time.<sup>3</sup> The apocalyptic writers were dualistic and stressed the demonic character of their world and age. God's new beginning must break through the fires of judgement before the Covenant ideal could again be fully realized. Theirs was a strong faith in the unfailing power and purpose of God which at the same time motivated them to a more stringent loyalty to the will of God as found in their Law, for the kingdom could not come to a disobedient people. This feeling was strong in the post-exilic prophets and is decidedly reflected in Daniel with its emphasis on obedience regardless of cost (Dan. 3,6). The Law-community with its strict separatism which followed on the exile and gave rise to Judaism as such was the correlative of the apocalyptic faith.<sup>4</sup> From these two, the Law emphasis and

---

pp. 119-135.

<sup>5</sup>Cf. the full discussion in Mowinkel, pp. 353ff., and also Otto pp. 201-218.

<sup>1</sup>Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, pp. 140ff.

<sup>2</sup>Rowley, The Relevance of Apocalyptic, p. 27.

<sup>3</sup>Vriezen, p. 369.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Bright, pp. 156-186.

apocalyptic-eschatology, come the motives which led to parties and sects in Judaism.

Before moving on to consider Judaism proper a summary word about the koinonia concept in the Old Testament will be helpful. The broad context is the sense of solidarity which characterized ancient societies and is in evidence throughout the Old Testament. But more specifically it is to be defined in terms of or seen in the Covenant relationship between God and his people Israel. For out of Israel's common inclusion or sharing-together in the Covenant with its attendant privileges and obligations ~~came~~ came a realistic sense of psychic unity or a koinonia "quality of life" which ideally affected the whole life of the people and marked the true Israelite. This was renewed and manifested in the cult of which the Passover was the most perfect expression.<sup>1</sup> Inconsistent with this "quality of life" was any lack of loyalty to the will of God (idolatry was the supreme expression) or failure of chesed in respect to the brother Israelite. Particularly when this ideal failed effectively to characterize the life of the people and nation did the thoughts of the faithful conceive of their national hope in terms of a revitalized and restored Covenant. Even when this hope began to take into it apocalyptic traits and the present Covenant loyalty focused in the Law its driving motive remained the insatiable desire for a full and consistent realization of the koinonia "quality of life" which was implicit in the Covenant concept. Thus the koinonia concept of the Old Testament must be viewed both in respect to the reality of its actual conception and

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Bo Reicke, Diakonie, Festfreude und Zelos (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1951), pp. 150-167, for the role of regard for the poor in the Old Testament cult.

expression in the historical life of the people of Israel and in terms of the role it played in their hope for the future.

### Contemporary Judaism

An indispensable part of the background picture is the conceptions and expressions of the Jewish religion contemporary to the origins of the Christian faith, for from the womb of Judaism was born the religion to which the New Testament bears its witness. Judaism is the organic and historical link between the religion and faith of the Old Testament and that of the New Testament. An examination of the manner in which the Covenant koinonia is expressed in the life and conceived in the hope of the Jewish people up to 70 A. D. is vital for a right understanding and proper appreciation of the New Testament phenomena under consideration.

The main stream.---The Judaism whose image is ineradicable<sup>1</sup> from the pages of the New Testament finds in the Old Testament both its general and particular rootage as a religion of distinct character. The changed conditions surrounding the exile and the return to Palestine led eventually to the restoration of the Law by Ezra, a priest and scribe not long returned from Babylonia, about 444 B.C.<sup>2</sup> just a few months after the completion of the Temple. At this time the Law was read to the

---

<sup>1</sup>Witness the possibility of such a statement as "Jesus was not a 'Christian', but a Jew" made by Bultmann, p. 84, and the assertion of F. C. Grant that "the theology of the New Testament, in its main outline, . . . was basically Pharisaic." Ancient Judaism and the New Testament (New York: Macmillan and Co., 1959), p. 11.

<sup>2</sup>Istodore Epstein, Judaism (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd., 1959), p. 84. Cf. George Foot Moore, Judaism (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927), I, 5-7.



people who in turn bound themselves to it by a covenant under the signature and seal of their notables (Neh. 10:28-30).<sup>1</sup> Stringent measures against intermarriage were taken as the result of a renewed emphasis on the preservation of purity of religion and race (Ezra 9-10; Neh. 10:28-30; 13:23ff.). The ideal theocracy was under way, the religious life of the people was focused in the worship of the temple and under the succession of scribes (soferim) from Ezra on, the Law became enthroned as "the final source of every Jewish norm and practice, rule and custom, in all departments of life--religious, moral, political, social, economic, and domestic."<sup>2</sup>

Another decisive series of events which contributed to the distinctive character of Judaism was that which was centered in the Maccabean revolt. This revolt, precipitated by the forced Hellenization policy of Antiochus IV (177-164 B.C.) and at first predominantly religiously motivated, set up Judah as an independent state under the Hasmonean kings. The Hasidim (᾽Ασσιδαίτοι), pious men whose motives were solely religious, once religious freedom had been regained could not sympathize with the developing political ambitions of the Hasmoneans and so broke with them, thus setting the stage for the parties which prevailed in Judaism until the complete triumph of Pharisaism in the years following the fall of Jerusalem in 70 A. D.<sup>3</sup> The new conditions resulting from the political success raised the basic question of the role of the Law in the total life of the people, the affairs of state included.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Moore, I, 7ff.

<sup>2</sup>Epstein, p. 85.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Moore, I, 48-109.

<sup>4</sup>G. H. C. MacGregor and A. C. Purdy, Jew and Greek: Tutors unto

The most important answers were those of the Pharisees and the Sadducees.<sup>1</sup> The former, the spiritual heirs of the Hasidim,<sup>2</sup> added tradition to the Law and asserted the comprehensive authority of the Law as interpreted by tradition over state and people. The Sadducees, consisting mostly of the former Hellenized elements,<sup>3</sup> did not allow tradition thus limiting the practability and therefore the scope of the Law particularly in the affairs of the nation. The great mass of people, while not belonging to either party, were on the side of the Pharisees.<sup>4</sup> Other movements existed,<sup>5</sup> and one, that of the ascetic Essenes, will be given detailed attention further on in the chapter.

The distinctive characteristic of Judaism as a religion was its emphasis on the Law, at once the product and cause of its unique doctrine of revelation, for it was their conviction that in the Scriptures God had revealed to his people ~~his people~~ his will for their whole life. It was a courageous and thorough-going attempt to control the total behaviour of man by his religion. The stress was upon observance producing a marked tolerance in belief and an equally marked intolerance in matters of observance. Religion was a manner of life, "a system of piety,"<sup>6</sup>

---

Christ (New edition; Edinburgh: The Saint Andrew Press, 1959), pp. 61-62, 93. Epstein, p. 96.

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Josephus Antiquities XIII 5, 9; 10, 5-6; XVIII 1, 2-4; Moore, I, 56-71; MacGregor and Purdy, pp. 87-102.

<sup>2</sup>Epstein, p. 95.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 96.

<sup>4</sup>Moore, I, 70. Josephus Antiquities XIII, 10, 6.

<sup>5</sup>Josephus Antiquities XVIII 1, 5-6.

<sup>6</sup>F. C. Grant, p. 57.

not merely a manner of thinking or feeling.<sup>1</sup> A new individualism emerged making religion in every sphere a personal relation between the individual and God, however,

not in isolation, but in the fellowship of the religious community and, ideally, of the whole Jewish people, the Keneset Israel. Not alone the synagogue but the entire communal life--even what we should call secular life--knit together by its peculiar beliefs, laws, and observances was the expression and bond of this fellowship. Thus Judaism became in the full sense personal religion without ceasing to be national religion.<sup>2</sup>

In this period, as in Ezra's day, the temple still stood and the feasts, particularly the Passover,<sup>3</sup> acted as a manifestation of national solidarity on the basis of the Covenant.<sup>4</sup> But the focal point of Jewish piety in the Tannaite age was the synagogue. Due to the cleavage between priest and people as a result of (1) the priestly aristocracy fostered by and allied to the Maccabees, (2) the Law-based rather than cult-based piety of the Pharisees and (3) the geographical factor, the inner center of the Jewish religion was subtly shifted.<sup>5</sup> The synagogue,<sup>6</sup> a lay institution, whose service became centered in the regular reading

---

<sup>1</sup>MacGregor and Purdy, p. 79.

<sup>2</sup>Moore, I, 121.

<sup>3</sup>See Above p. 130. L

<sup>4</sup>Shedd, p. 55. The historic conception of Covenant is assumed in this discussion for it remained in Shedd's words "the fundamental conception of the bond of unity of Judaism." The concern is with the manner of Israel's continuation and application to life of this historic bond. Shedd's second chapter, "Early Jewish Conceptions of the Solidarity of the Human Race," pp. 42-85, contains a thorough discussion of their sense of solidarity at this time.

<sup>5</sup>MacGregor and Purdy, pp. 82-83.

<sup>6</sup>Cf. Moore, I, 281-307.



and exposition of the Law had allowed the Pharisees their great influence. Along with the school<sup>1</sup> it was the instrument of what in Moore's words was "of the utmost moment in all the subsequent history of Judaism . . . the endeavor to educate the whole people in its religion";<sup>2</sup> and that not alone in Palestine but throughout the Diaspora. The Law became "the Jew's 'portable fatherland,' mightier than the cult prescribed by it."<sup>3</sup> Participation in the cult was a demonstration of loyalty to the Law;<sup>4</sup> the validity of the cult lay in the Law, not vice-versa.

Attendant upon the observance of the Temple-rites was also an anticipation of eschatological joy<sup>5</sup> for the Law emphasis had not smothered the prophetic expectation, but was itself a correlative of a reorientated hope generated by the same historical and religious circumstances. While the eschatological picture is one of complexity,<sup>6</sup> at its heart lay the faith that the history of the world is a plan of God that he will carry it through to his appointed end.<sup>7</sup> This Covenant hope contained the two major strains already outlined in the preceding discussion of the Old Testament.

One can be called the national expectation, drawn from the proph-

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., I, 308-322.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., I, 281.

<sup>3</sup>MacGregor and Purdy, p. 83.

<sup>4</sup>Bultmann, p. 70.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid. Cf. Bo Reicke, Diakonie, Festfreude und Zelos, pp. 186-200.

<sup>6</sup>"Nothing is more characteristic of Jewish eschatology than its variety." F. C. Grant, p. 67.

<sup>7</sup>Moore, II, 323.

ets, a political renaissance of the golden age of the past under a prince of the Davidic line with liberation without and regeneration within--"the recovery of independence and power, an era of peace and prosperity, of fidelity to God and his law, of justice and fair-dealing and brotherly love among men, and of personal rectitude and piety."<sup>1</sup> This form of the hope was most probably the more prominent one among the scribes and the leaders of the Pharisees. The Psalms of Solomon,<sup>2</sup> a Pharisaic book dating from the last half of the first century B. C., reflects in the main this type of hope.<sup>3</sup> Pointing also in this direction is the fact that in the Rabbinic writings there are no messianic sayings from the first generation of the Tannaim who died before 70 A.D. The reason for this according to Klausner,<sup>4</sup> is that while the Temple stood the foremost Pharisees did not see the necessity of elaborating further the messianic ideas of the prophets. Even in connection with this form of the hope, however, the Pharisees came to hold to a belief in a resurrection by which God's promises to the righteous that they should come to share in the coming salvation of Israel would be fulfilled.<sup>5</sup> This latter doctrine was the only eschatological belief consist-

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., II, 324.

<sup>2</sup>R. H. Charles, The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1913), II, 625-652.

<sup>3</sup>Klausner, pp. 317-324. Paul Volz, Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter (2nd ed.; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr Paul Siebeck, 1934), p. 26 comments: "Die Ähnlichkeit dieser Psalmen mit den kanonischen ist unverkennbar, hier pulsiert mehr innerliche Religiosität als apokalyptischen Weitblick. Der eschatologische Sieg kommt nicht durch die nationale Freiheitsbewegung, sondern durch das Wunder der göttlichen Gnade." Cf. his summary chart pp. 420-421. h/k

<sup>4</sup>Klausner, pp. 392f.

<sup>5</sup>Moore, II, 313f. Cf. pp. 287-322.

ently held by the adherents of the synagogue.<sup>1</sup>

The second strain is that of the apocalyptic, "die überirdische Zukunftshoffnung" in distinction to "die irdische,"<sup>2</sup> whose main features are summed up by Klausner as a

complete Messianic chain whose separate links are: the signs of the Messiah, the birth pangs of Messiah, the coming of Elijah, the trumpet of Messiah, the ingathering of the exiles, the reception of proselytes, the war with God and Magog, the Days of the Messiah, the renovation of the world, the Day of Judgement, the resurrection of the dead, the World to Come.<sup>3</sup>

This more transcendental and speculative type of hope, for the consistency was in general character rather than in details,<sup>4</sup> overlapped considerably with the national expectation drawing it into a more supernatural framework and thereby transfiguring it.<sup>5</sup> It was among the common people and those cultured persons who were not inclined toward Halakhah that these ideas flourished.<sup>6</sup> In Klausner's words they "were balm to the broken hearts of the educated in the nation and food for the marvel-seeking imagination of the common people."<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Volz, p. 1.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 2.

<sup>3</sup>Klausner, p. 385. He discusses these concepts in accordance with their occurrence in each of the books of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha respectively, pp. 246-387, and topically for the period of the Tannaim, pp. 388-518. For a topical treatment of the Jewish eschatological concepts on the basis of the whole literature of the period see the work by Volz. Moore, II, 279-397, provides a briefer discussion.

<sup>4</sup>Volz, p. 1.

<sup>5</sup>Moore, II, 323f.

<sup>6</sup>Klausner, p. 385.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid.



The Jewish hope of this period in their Messianic idea had woven together the conceptions of politico-national salvation and religio-spiritual redemption;<sup>1</sup> the Messianic figure(s) was truly human, a superb instrument of God, the latter being in actuality the primary figure.<sup>2</sup> The expectation of a Messianic age in this world was not precluded by the belief in the world to come but remained a phase of the overall hope.<sup>3</sup> A witness to this was the existence of the Zealots<sup>4</sup> who made the broader Jewish conception of the Kingdom of Heaven<sup>5</sup> a revolutionary principle attempting to force the Messianic age by political revolt. This conception of the sovereignty or rule of God, present wherever men recognized it, looked forward to the day when that reign will be universally realized in the lives of all men in their relation to God and their fellow man as the end of all God's ways, the goal of human history (Zech. 14:9; Ob. 17ff.; Is. 23, 24; Dan. 7).<sup>6</sup> This concept is basic to all their messianic expectations, eschatological formulations and apocalyptic imaginations. A final important feature in the overall picture of the Jewish hope is the individualization of religion by their eschatology with its fundamental tenet of the resurrection and final judgement at

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 392.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., pp. 520, 524. Moore, II, 349.

<sup>3</sup>Moore, II, 344, 375. Klausner, pp. 516ff.

<sup>4</sup>Josephus, Antiquities XVIII 1, 6. MacGregor and Purdy, pp. 117-124.

<sup>5</sup>Moore, II, 371-375. Cf. Gustaf H. Dalman, The Words of Jesus, tr. D. M. Kay (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909), pp. 91-101; Strack and Billerbeck, I, 172ff.

<sup>6</sup>Moore, II, 271-272.

which every man must account for himself. Progress was made toward the solving of the problem of theodicy and the belief in the resurrection became general in Judaism with the exception of the Sadducees.<sup>1</sup> This was the most striking and consistent difference between the earlier and later forms of the Jewish hope.<sup>2</sup>

In general one can in Judaism as in the Old Testament describe any koinonia "quality of life" in terms of the historic Covenant, for it continued as their "fundamental conception of the bond of unity."<sup>3</sup> Although this common relation to God in the Covenant found expression as always in the cult,<sup>4</sup> its practical realization lay more in adherence to the Law. Their hope for the ideal fulfilment of the Covenant in which perfect koinonia could exist moved in varying degrees between the more prophetic messianic "golden age" and an apocalyptic transfiguration of it resulting in an entirely new age or world beyond history. The influence of the Law, the eschatological shift and their contact with Greek culture with their cumulating individualizing tendencies, however, tended to undermine the ancient sense of solidarity in Israel and made their overall unity more a matter of an idealistic and theological dogma.<sup>5</sup> Thus sects and parties arose which exhibited their own peculiar koinonia.

The ideal expression of the Covenant bond which existed between

---

<sup>1</sup>Josephus Antiquities XVIII 1, 4.

<sup>2</sup>Moore, II, 377-395.

<sup>3</sup>Shedd, p. 55.

<sup>4</sup>For the expression in the cult of material concern and eschatological perspective cf. Bo Reicke, Diakonie, Festfreude und Zelos, pp. 150-200.

<sup>5</sup>Shedd, p. 88.

men in Judaism was still based on the principle of "you shall love your neighbor as yourself (Lev. 19:18)" but as Moore comments

there is no reason to think that reality came nearer to this sublime ideal in the days of Asmonaeans or of Herod than in those of Uzziah and Jereboam II, when the prophets thundered against the wrongs that the rich and powerful inflicted upon their less fortunate countrymen.<sup>1</sup>

The distinctive characteristic of the period was that this social strife deepened more and more into a religious cleavage until in the first and especially in the second century A. D. it became almost entirely that.<sup>2</sup>

This cleavage according to the Rabbis was between the  $\text{חברים}$  and the

$\text{זקנים}$ ,<sup>3</sup> between those who knew and scrupulously observed the obligations of the law and the ignorant and negligent masses. The

$\text{חברים}$  or "Associates" were composed of the stricter of the Pharisees

who bound themselves into a  $\text{חברותא}$  "Association" pledging themselves particularly to the payment of the priest's portion and the tithes from all foods and the observance of the complicated rules dealing with ritual purity.<sup>4</sup>

The strict adherence to these regulations precluded almost all business and social intercourse with those who could not be trusted in these matters, in the last analysis all who had not pledged themselves as members of the  $\text{חברותא}$  be they otherwise ever so learned and pious Jews.<sup>5</sup> They were thus a tightly bound society existing in but strictly

---

<sup>1</sup>Moore, II, 156. Cf. pp. 162-197 for a detailed discussion of the ideals and practices in the realm of social ethic in Judaism.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., pp. 156-158.

<sup>3</sup>Neusner, pp. 125-142. Hauck, p. 803.  $\text{חברים}$  is from the root  $\text{חבר}$  which it is to be remembered, normally lies behind the koinonia language in the LXX.

<sup>4</sup>MacGregor and Purdy, p. 126.

<sup>5</sup>Apart from the discussion in Moore, II, 156-161, the detailed



separate from the larger group. And while they had a koinonia "quality of life" all their own, it certainly did not facilitate the larger sense of solidarity. Anyone, however, who was willing to order his life accordingly and pledge himself to do so in the presence of the  $\overline{\eta \zeta \eta \zeta \eta}$  was free to join them. Moore suggests that much of the animosity displayed towards the  $\zeta \overline{\eta \zeta \eta} \overline{\eta \zeta \eta}$  was due to the willful ignorance and negligence by the latter of those things which the  $\overline{\eta \zeta \eta \zeta \eta}$  considered so vital.<sup>1</sup>

A company of persons joined together for a common meal may also be designated as a  $\overline{\overline{7}} \cdot \overline{7} \sqcup \underline{11}$ . It was in the same manner applied to the gathering of friends in a common meal on Friday evening for the purpose of beginning the Sabbath. More interestingly, those who came together in order to celebrate the Passover formed a  $\overline{\overline{7}} \cdot \overline{7} \sqcup \underline{11}$ .<sup>2</sup>

Essene doctrine and practice.--A small but highly fascinating part of the Judaism of the period is that represented by the Dead Sea Scrolls and the community from which they came. This sectarian segment

regulations of the 7777 are documented by Sally Lieberman, "The Discipline in the so-called Dead Sea Discipline," Journal of Biblical Literature LXXI (December 1952), pp. 199-206, and Chaim Rabin, Qumran Studies, Scripta Judaica II (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1957). Rabin views the Qumran sect as "a die-hard Pharisee group trying to uphold 'genuine' Pharisaism (as they understood it) against the more flexible ideology introduced by the Rabbis in authority." p. 69.

<sup>1</sup>Moore, II, 160.

<sup>2</sup>Hauck, p. 803. David Daube, The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism (University of London: The Athlone Press, 1956), pp. 332-335 sees the Passover  $\overline{\text{פסח}}$  implied in the Gethsemane accounts in the Gospels of Matthew and Mark. Cf. "Pesahim," The Mishnah, tr. Herbert Danby (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1933), pp. 136-151.

of the Jewish people developed their own peculiar koinonia. Thus they are of special import for the present study particularly in view of the great interest shown in them by modern New Testament studies.

While the exact relationship of the community at Qumran to the descriptions of Philo (20 B.C. - 45 A.D.) and Josephus (A.D. 37 - 100)<sup>1</sup> is perhaps complex, it is fairly certain that the community was Essene in character.<sup>2</sup> Thus when Philo writes concerning the Essenes of their τὴν τῶν τῶν τοῦ κρείττονα κοινωνίαν,<sup>3</sup> the value of a look at such a group which is both contemporary to<sup>4</sup> and with similar religious-historical rootage to early Christianity is evident. It must

<sup>1</sup>Philo Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit XII-XIII (75-91); Hypothetica XI, 1-18 (Loeb). The latter is a fragment of his otherwise lost Apologia pro Judaeis preserved in Eusebius' Praeparatio Evangelica VIII 11. Josephus Antiquities XIII 5, 9; XV 10, 4f.; XVII 13, 3; XVIII 1, 5; Bellum Judaicum II 8, 2-13. Cf. Philo's description of the Therapeutae De Vita Contemplativa which may be linked to the Essenes. Geza Vermes, "The Etymology of 'Essenes'," Revue de Qumran (June 1960), pp. 435-443, connects the two, at least etymologically. Pliny Naturalis Historia V 15, 73 also refers to the Essenes.

<sup>2</sup>W. F. Albright, "Recent Discoveries in Palestine and the Gospel of John," The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology, ed. W. D. Davies and D. Daube (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1956), p. 165, says that "there can be no doubt that the sectarians were . . . Essenes." See further the discussion in Millar Burrows, More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls (London: Secker and Warburgh, 1958), pp. 253-274. For a concise discussion of the problem cf. A. R. C. Leaney, R. P. C. Hanson and J. Posen, A Guide to the Scrolls (London: S. C. M. Press, 1958), pp. 54-57.

<sup>3</sup>Philo Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit 84, 91 (Loeb). Cf. Hypothetica 11:1; 11:14; 11:16. Josephus Bellum Judaicum II 8, 3 (122 Loeb) uses τὸ κοινωνικόν in description of their community of goods, but he never employs κοινωνία of the Essenes.

<sup>4</sup>Following the view held by many scholars that the occupation of the site at Qumran by an Essene group began no later than the reign of Alexander Jannaeus (103-76 B.C.) and with the exception of 37-4 B.C. continued until the Jewish revolt against Rome

be kept in mind, however, that for present purposes this sectarian movement had a development of approximately two hundred years,<sup>1</sup> that the available literature derives from different stages and that the scope of its reference may vary; for the Qumran community can be considered only a part, although very probably the focus, of the Essene sect.<sup>2</sup> The Damascus Document (CD)<sup>3</sup> and the Rule of the Community (IQS)<sup>4</sup> are concerned with the sect which centered at Qumran, but they most probably

---

(A.D. 66-70). F. M. Cross Jr., The Ancient Library of Qumran (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., Ltd., 1958), pp. 42-47. For other theories cf. Burrows, pp. 228-252.

<sup>1</sup>What became of them is beyond the scope of this study. Cf. Oscar Cullmann, "The Significance of the Qumran Texts for Research into the Beginnings of Christianity," The Scrolls and the New Testament, ed. Krister Stendahl (London: S. C. M. Press, 1958), pp. 18-32, and H. J. Schoeps, Urgemeinde, Judenchristentum, Gnosis (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1956).

<sup>2</sup>These considerations are important primarily for detailed descriptions of their manner of life, for the sources are not identical at this point.

<sup>3</sup>First published by Solomon Schechter, Documents of Jewish Sectaries, vol. I, Fragments of a Zadokite Work (Cambridge: University Press, 1910). For text, translation and notes since the discovery of the Qumran material cf. Chaim Rabin, The Zadokite Documents (2nd. ed.; Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1958). Fragments of these Documents were discovered in caves IV, V and VI at Qumran. Burrows, p. 407. See further H. H. Rowley, The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1952).

<sup>4</sup>Otherwise known as the Manual of Discipline and published by Millar Burrows, John C. Trevor and William H. Brownlee, The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery, Vol. II, Fascicle 2: Plates and transmission of the Manual of Discipline (New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1951). An early annotated translation is that of William H. Brownlee, Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, Supplementary Studies, Nos. 10-12, The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline (New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1951). Cf. also the more recent translation and commentary by P. Wernberg Möller, The Manual of Discipline, Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, I, ed. J. Van der Ploeg (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1957).



represent different stages in its development. Which stage is earlier and the nature of their actual relation to each other is still a matter of great dispute,<sup>1</sup> though the composition of both clearly dates from the last two centuries B.C.<sup>2</sup> The first century descriptions of Philo and Josephus are probably based on the center at Qumran, but not limited to it. The differences which exist between their picture and that of the Rule of the Community can be mostly accounted for by the passage of time and the disparity of viewpoint.

If one is to ascribe to this sect a koinonia "quality of life" the first question to be asked concerns the vertical dimension of their sharing-together. What were the motives and conceptions which formed the raison d'être of their communal life and separation from the religious life of the rest of the Jewish nation? The roots of the sect go back to the Hasidim of Maccabean times (I Maccabees 2:14-4,)<sup>3</sup> who were devoted to the Law (I Maccabees 2:42) and probably to the Zadokite priesthood (Ezek. 44:15).<sup>4</sup> The Hasidim eventually parted ways with the Hasmoneans because of the political motives and Hellenizing tendencies

---

<sup>1</sup>For example, Hanson in Leaney, Hanson and Posen, pp. 62ff. thinks that CD represents an earlier stage than IQS while Cross, p. 60, would have it just the opposite. Cf. Burrows, More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls, pp. 217-227, for the various theories of relationship.

<sup>2</sup>Møller, p. 20, dates IQS in the first half of the second century B.C. and remarks in relation to CD that "it is hardly possible to say with certainty which of the two reflects the earlier stage."

<sup>3</sup>Burrows, More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls, pp. 256f. Cf. the discussion in Cross, pp. 95-119, and in A. S. van der Woude, Die Messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumran, Studia Semitica Neerlandica III, ed. M. A. Beek, J. H. Hospers and Th. C. Vriezen (Assen: Van Gorcum & Comp. N. V., 1957), pp. 217ff.

<sup>4</sup>Cross, pp. 37ff. Cf. CD 3:18-4:4.

of the latter; the majority forming the party of the Pharisees.<sup>1</sup> But there remained a more radical minority whose expectations of the establishment of the kingdom of everlasting righteousness (Dan. 9:24f.), whose puritan convictions and whose belief in the divine right of the Zadokite priesthood in particular could not be reconciled in any way to the Hasmonean dynasty of priest-kings.<sup>2</sup> It was from this more eschatologically-minded group towards the end of the second century that there arose a leader, called "The Teacher of Righteousness" (CD 1:11; IQpHab. 1:4; 2:8<sup>3</sup>), a priest of Zadok lineage<sup>4</sup> whose new interpretation of Scripture enabled them to see the role which they were to play in the fulfilling of God's purpose in the last days which were at hand.<sup>5</sup> In accordance with Isaiah 40:3 (IQS 8:12-14) the group went out to live in camps (CD 7:6-7)<sup>6</sup> in the wilderness of Judea binding themselves in a "new covenant" (CD 6:19; 8:21; 20:12; IQH 2:3<sup>7</sup> cf. Jer. 31:31-34; Ezek. 36:22-28) to devote themselves under the direction of Zadok priests to

---

<sup>1</sup>Josephus Antiquities XIII 10, 5.

<sup>2</sup>F. F. Bruce, Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts (London: Tyndale Press, 1959), p. 27. He sees a reference to this group in Daniel 11:33-35.

<sup>3</sup>The Commentary on Habakkuk published by Millar Burrows, John C. Trevor and William H. Brownlee, The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery, Vol. I (New Haven: The American Schools of Oriental Research, 1950), and translated by M. Burrows in The Dead Sea Scrolls (London: Secker & Warberg, 1956), pp. 365-370.

<sup>4</sup>Cross, p. 96.

<sup>5</sup>Bruce, Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts, p. 28.

<sup>6</sup>Philo Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit 76 (Loeb).

<sup>7</sup>The Hymns of Thanksgiving published by E. L. Sukenik, Osar Hamegilloth ha-genuzoth (Jerusalem: The Hebrew University, 1954). A translation is given in Theodor H. Gaster, The Dead Sea Scriptures (New York: Doubleday & Company, 1956), pp. 123ff.

the study and practice of the Law (IQS 5:2-3)<sup>1</sup> and community of property until the appointed hour of God.

Thus they can be viewed as a sectarian development of the post-exilic concept of Israel as a law community<sup>2</sup> set in a more acute eschatological context. The "new covenant"<sup>3</sup> to which they have bound themselves is that of the Fathers (CD 1:4; 8:18) and an "eternal covenant" (IQS 4:22). They alone are the elect and faithful remnant (IQpHab. 2:3; CD 1:4-10; 2:14-3:20; IQH 6:7f.) preserved of God as

an eternal plant, a holy house consisting of Israel, and a most holy congregation consisting of Aaron, true witnesses about uprightness, chosen by (divine) pleasure to atone for the earth and to punish the impious (IQS 8:5-6).<sup>4</sup>

They considered themselves true, spiritual Israel, and the covenant (IQS 1:16) which they kept by strict adherence to the law was eschatologically conditioned (CD 12:23-13:1; IQS 9:11). They were on the brink of "the end of days" (IQSa 1)<sup>5</sup> which was to be ushered in by an eschatol-

<sup>1</sup>"They shall be a community, with Torah study and property, submitting response according to the sons of Zadok, the priests who keep the covenant, and according to the multitude of the men of the community who hold fast to the covenant." The translation is from Møller, pp. 27f. Cf. Philo Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit 80-81 (Loeb).

<sup>2</sup>Møller, p. 20, points out a possible connection with the ascetic Rechabites: "It is also curious to note that ancient rabbinic tradition has it that the Essenes were the spiritual descendants of the Rechabites, who, at the division of Palestine, were given the area round Jericho, and that IQS in two passages (vi 2, 14) appears to allude to Jer. xxxv, our only source of information about the Rechabites in the Old Testament." For further discussion of this relationship cf. C. D. Ginsberg, The Essenes, The Kabbalah (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1955).

<sup>3</sup>The adjective "new" never occurs in IQS with covenant. Cf. van der Woude, p. 187.

<sup>4</sup>Møller, p. 33.

<sup>5</sup>The Rule of the Congregation published by D. Barthelemy, O. P.



ogical war of vengeance by "the sons of light" against the enemies of God,

the sons of darkness, the army of Belial, against the troop of Edom and Moab and the sons of Ammon, against the people of Philistia, and against the troops of the Kittim of Assyria, and with them as helpers the violaters of the covenant"<sup>1</sup> (IQM 1:1f.).<sup>2</sup>

Likewise there will appear "the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel" (IQS 9:11; cf. CD 12:23f.; 14:19; 19:34-20:1) who will be the leaders of the community in the new age (IQSa 2), the priestly Messiah being of the higher rank. The role of a third figure, "a prophet" (IQS 9:11), perhaps to be identified with the priest of the new age, is obscure.<sup>3</sup> The Teacher of Righteousness was most likely not a messianic figure in the eschatological expectations of the community.<sup>4</sup>

There is reason to suppose that the Qumran community conceived of itself as fulfilling a messianic mission of expiation and judgement,

---

and J. T. Milik, Qumran Cave I: Discoveries in the Judaean Desert I (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1955), pp. 108-117. An annotated translation in French is given. For an English rendering, cf. Burrows, More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls, pp. 393ff.

<sup>1</sup>Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 390.

<sup>2</sup>The Rule of War published by Sukenik, Gaster, The Dead Sea Scriptures, pp. 281ff, gives a full English translation. The text, translation and commentary is given in Jean Carmignac, La Règle de la Guerre (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1958). The emphasis on war is possibly a late development as the sect became more Zealot-minded. Cf. J. T. Milik, Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea, tr. J. Strugnell (London: SCM Press, 1959), pp. 94ff.

<sup>3</sup>On this and the whole Qumran Messianic question cf. A. S. van der Woude, especially pp. 185-189, Bruce, Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts, pp. 41-55, and Karl George Kuhn, "The Two Messiahs of Aaron and Israel," The Scrolls and the New Testament, ed. Krister Stendahl (London: SCM Press, 1958), pp. 54-64.

<sup>4</sup>Bruce, Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts, p. 55.

identifying itself with the roles of the Servant of the Lord and the Son of Man.<sup>1</sup> They had rejected the temple sacrifices<sup>2</sup> and in line with the priestly character of their community (IQS 5:2) thought of themselves as a spiritual temple (IQS 9:3-7)<sup>3</sup> in which the acceptable sacrifices were "an offering of the lips . . . and perfection of way" which made "atonement for the guilt of transgression and sinful infidelity" and brought about "divine favor of the land more than flesh of whole burnt offerings and than fats of sacrifice."<sup>4</sup> It was in this manner that they viewed their careful study of the Law of God and their patient endurance of persecution as sacrifices of obedience and praise which would be accepted of God not only on their behalf but also as a propitiation made in behalf of their erring kinsmen (IQS 3:6-16; 4:20-21; 5:6-7; 8:5-10; 9:3-5). The Rule of the Congregation reads (1:1-3):

And this is the order for the whole congregation of Israel at the end of days, when they are gathered together to conduct themselves as directed by the judgement of the sons of Zadok the priests and the men of their covenant, who turned back from walking in the way of the people. They are the men of his counsel who have kept his covenant in the midst of wickedness to atone for the land.<sup>5</sup>

On the basis of this conception of their mission coupled with these definite allusions to the Servant Songs in the Hymns of Thanksgiving in which the spokesman claims to be the Servant (IQH 7:10; 8:26f.; 8:35f.;

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 56-66.

<sup>2</sup>Josephus Antiquities XVIII 1, 5. Philo Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit, 75.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. the discussion by David Flusser, "The Dead Sea Sect and Pre-Pauline Christianity," Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Vol. IV of Scripta Hierosolymitana, ed. Chaim Rabin and Yigael Yadin (Jerusalem: At the Magnes Press, The Hebrew University, 1958), pp. 227-235.

<sup>4</sup>IQS 9:4-5. The translation is that of W. H. Brownlee, p. 34.

<sup>5</sup>Burrows, More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 393.

9:29-32; 13:18-19; 14:25; 17:26) Bruce concludes "that the Qumran community felt itself called upon to fulfil the ministry of the Servant of the Lord, who by obedience and suffering makes atonement for the sins of many and turns them to righteousness."<sup>1</sup> He points out that there is also a possible connection between the Priestly messiah and the Servant in their thought.<sup>2</sup>

Linked with the mission of propitiation is that of judgement (IQS 5:6-7; 8:10) for "into the hand of his elect God will deliver the judgement of all the nations and by their chastisement all the wicked among his people will be punished." (IQpHab. 1:12).<sup>3</sup> This is the role of "one like a son of man" whom Daniel interpreted as "the saints of the Most High" to whom judgement and royal dominion are given (Dan. 7:13-22). "The saints of the Most High" appears to have been assumed by the community as a name (CD 20:8; cf. IQM 10:10, "saints of the covenant"). It is this twofold responsibility of expiation and judgement to which these "sons of the covenant" bound themselves by rigid obedience to the law of God that explains their rigid discipline.<sup>4</sup>

Thus the vertical dimension which gave cohesion to the community is fairly clear. They had an eschatological mission with its attending messianic hope to fulfil which destiny could only be accomplished by perfect obedience to the Law. This was their interpretation of the Covenant and its obligations. The role of the Spirit in this life and

---

<sup>1</sup>Bruce, Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts, p. 62.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., pp. 56f. and 62f.

<sup>3</sup>Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 367.

<sup>4</sup>Bruce, Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts, p. 66.



hope is somewhat vague. Only one passage gives the Spirit eschatological significance (IQS 4:18-22; cf. 9:3-4; CD 2:9-13). More characteristic is the ethicized "spirit of truth" (IQS 3:13-4:26) by which in contrast to the "spirit of error" the "sons of truth" were to walk. Although the emphasis is ethical, the cosmic dimension is not absent.<sup>1</sup>

Nötscher observes in summary:

In jeder Hinsicht ist der heilige Geist für die Gemeinschaft von Qumran so wichtig, dass er geradezu ein konstitutives Element derselben bildet. . . . Er ist die treibende, belebende moralische Kraft in der Gemeinschaft, mit der sie ihre Aufgabe erfüllt und ihr Ziel erreicht, mit der verglichen die rituellen Opfer nichts bedeuten.<sup>2</sup>

Indicative of the koinonia "quality of life" which characterizes the Essenes is the term  $\text{אֶחָד}$ , literally "the Unity,"<sup>3</sup> This term was the principal designation of the community par excellence, that is, at Qumran (IQS 1:1, 12; 5:5, 6; 6:18, 19; 9:2; CD 20:32).<sup>4</sup> In the Rule of the Community it is found in such combinations as  $\text{אֶחָד הָיָה אֲנִי}$  (1:16; cf. 1:1),  $\text{אֶחָד הָיָה אֲנִי}$  (3:2; 5:7; 6:3, 10, 13, 14, 16; 7:2, 22, 24; 8:1,

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Eduard Schweizer, "Gegenwart des Geistes und eschatologische Hoffnung bei Zarathustra, spätjüdischen Gruppen, Gnostikern und den Zeugen des Neuen Testaments," The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology, ed. W. D. Davies and D. Daube (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1956), pp. 488ff., W. D. Davies, "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Flesh and Spirit," The Scrolls and the New Testament, ed. Krister Stendahl (London: SCM Press, 1958), pp. 171-182, Burrows, More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls, pp. 277-289, Jacob Licht, "An Analysis of the Treatise of the Two Spirits in DSD," Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Vol. IV of Scripta Hierosolymitana, ed. Chaim Rabin and Yigael Yadin (Jerusalem: At the Magnes Press, The Hebrew University, 1958), pp. 88ff. and Friedrich Nötscher, "Heiligkeit in den Qumranschriften," Revue de Qumran (June 1960), pp. 333-344.

<sup>2</sup>Nötscher, pp. 341-342.

<sup>3</sup>Cross, p. 155.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 58.

5, 22; 11:8; cf. IQSa 1:26, 27; 2:2, 11),  $\text{תַּחַת הַשָּׁמַיִם}$  (5:1, 3, 16; 6:21; 8:11, 15; 9:6, 10, 19; cf. CD 20:32) and  $\text{תַּחַת הַיָּד$  (6:19; 7:17, 18; 8:10)<sup>1</sup> on the one hand and  $\text{לֹא תַחַת}$  (1:12; 2:22),  $\text{לֹא תַחַת}$  (2:24; cf. 2:26),  $\text{שֶׁתַּחַת}$  (9:2; cf. 5:20),  $\text{תַּחַת הַיָּד}$  (8:15-16),  $\text{זֶלְזָלְתָּ תַּחַת}$  (5:5) and  $\text{זֶלְזָלְתָּ עַל הַיָּד}$  (3:12) on the other. It is readily observed that the two dimensions of Essene communal life are focused in the use of  $\text{תַּחַת}$ .

Even the occasional use of the verb is not without significance, for example, "all who dedicate themselves to do God's ordinances shall be brought into the covenant of friendship ( $\text{תַּחַת הַיָּד}$ ), to be united ( $\text{תַּחַת הַיָּד}$ ) in God's counsel" (IQS 1:7-8).<sup>2</sup> More expressive is IQS 9:5-6: "at that time the men of the community ( $\text{תַּחַת הַיָּד}$ ) shall be set apart, a house of holiness for Aaron, to be united as a holy of holies ( $\text{זֶלְזָלְתָּ תַּחַת הַיָּד}$ ) and a house of community ( $\text{תַּחַת הַיָּד}$ ) for Israel."<sup>3</sup> That  $\text{תַּחַת}$  is used in a strictly qualitative sense as a substantive can be seen in IQS 5:3 where it is linked in a series with truth ( $\text{אֱמֻנָה}$ ) and humility ( $\text{עֲנוּוּת}$ ).<sup>4</sup> Other instances of  $\text{תַּחַת}$  in the more normal adverbial sense emphasize the communal aspect;<sup>5</sup> the men of the  $\text{תַּחַת}$  devote themselves to His truth

<sup>1</sup>The Rule of the Congregation uses the phrases  $\text{שֶׁתַּחַת}$  (1:9) and  $\text{תַּחַת}$  (2:21).

<sup>2</sup>Brownlee, p. 6.

<sup>3</sup>Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 383. Cf. IQS 5:14 for the use of the verb in a context stressing separation from those outside the community.

<sup>4</sup>Brownlee, p. 12, at IQS 3:7 sees another such instance: "and through a holy spirit disposed toward Unity" but Möller, pp. 24 and 61 objects. The Hebrew is  $\text{תַּחַת הַיָּד}$ .

<sup>5</sup>Ralph Marcus, "Philo, Josephus and the Dead Sea YAHAD," Journal

(IQS 5:10),<sup>1</sup> walk together (IQS 4:18),<sup>2</sup> eat together (IQS 6:2)<sup>3</sup> at a common table (IQSa 2:17-18),<sup>4</sup> say benedictions together (IQS 6:3; cf. 6:8),<sup>5</sup> take counsel together (IQS 6:3)<sup>6</sup> and study together (6:24).<sup>7</sup>

Pertinent at this point is IQS 5:2: "they shall be a community with Torah study and property,"<sup>8</sup> which introduces another aspect of their way of life.

Thus the very nature of the koinonia "quality of life" of those who enter  $\text{לְאֵלֵינוּ יָבֹאוּ} \text{ (IQS 1:16)}$  is interestingly indicated by  $\text{יָחַד}$ .<sup>9</sup> One cannot avoid the possibility of a terminological connec-

---

of Biblical Literature LXXI IV (December 1952), p. 207, observes that the substantive use of yahad in biblical and post-biblical Hebrew is unusual with yahad more normally meaning "together" rather than "community." Cross, pp. 58f., n. 43, remarking about the usage in the Scrolls goes on to say: "Often, of course, the term yahad means simply 'fellowship,' 'communion,' and in combination, 'communal' as in such an expression as 'communal council.' Thus even in its seemingly more technical use as a designation of the settlement, one dare not ignore its qualitative or descriptive character. Cf. the more recent and thorough study by Johann Maier, "Zum Begriff  $\text{יָחַד}$  in den Texten von Qumran," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 72, 2 (1960), pp. 148-166.

<sup>1</sup>  $\text{הָיָה יָחַד לְאֵלֵינוּ}$

<sup>2</sup>  $\text{יָחַד יָתֵהוּכֵךְ}$

<sup>3</sup>  $\text{יָחַד יִינָכְלוּ}$

<sup>4</sup>  $\text{הָיָה יָחַד הַשְׁלָלָה}$

<sup>5</sup>  $\text{יָחַד יִבְלָכֻךְ}$

<sup>6</sup>  $\text{יָחַד יִנְעָלֵךְ}$

<sup>7</sup>  $\text{יָחַד יִמְדָּלֵךְ}$

<sup>8</sup>  $\text{לְהֵיטָא יָחַד בְּתוֹרָה וּבְנִיכָלָה}$  The translation is from Möller, p. 27.

<sup>9</sup>For the theological connotation of  $\text{יָחַד}$  see the important discussion by Maier, pp. 146-148, who posits a "Begriff der Einung" expressive of the self-understanding of the group as a



tion with Philo when he writes: "Multitudes of his disciples has the lawgiver trained ἐπὶ κοινωρίαν (  $\tau\pi\tau$  )."<sup>1</sup> Striking too is the way  $\tau\pi\tau$  points up the two-dimensional quality of their life as does koinonia in the New Testament. And in the New Testament the Johannine emphasis on unity which is summed up by the use of koinonia in I John 1 has interesting affinities to the Essene use of  $\tau\pi\tau$ .<sup>2</sup>

The association at Qumran was voluntary (IQS 1:1-12; 5:1-10)<sup>3</sup> involving community of property (IQS 1:12; 5:2, 6:18-23; 9:7-8) with an attendant spirit of brotherhood which captured the awe and admiration of both Philo<sup>4</sup> and Josephus.<sup>5</sup> Philo wrote of their "ineffable sense of fellowship (τὴν πάντων λόγου κρείττονα κοινωρίαν ), which is the clearest evidence of a perfect and supremely happy life,"<sup>6</sup> and Josephus mentioning their scorn of riches remarks: καὶ θαυμασίον [ἦν] αὐτοῖς τὸ κοινωριεῖν .<sup>7</sup> Philo further writes of their

locale of "Tempelheiligtum" with the emphasis on  $\tau\pi\tau$  "als Vollzug einer Lebensweise . . . welche die Unterscheidung von rein and unrein garantiert." He sees this primary priestly orientation of  $\tau\pi\tau$  in its integral relation to the Covenant concept and eschatological motif.

<sup>1</sup> Philo Hypothetica 11:1, tr. F. H. Colson Loeb, (1941), p. 437. Cf. 11:14, 16. Cross, p. 58 is of the opinion that "Philo's frequent use of κοινωρία of the sect, especially in such passages as Hypothetica 11, 1, certainly reflects Essene usage."

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Cross, pp. 155f.

<sup>3</sup> Philo, Hypothetica 11:2.

<sup>4</sup> Philo, Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit 85-87; Hypothetica 11:4.

<sup>5</sup> Josephus Antiquities XVIII 1, 5; Bellum Judaicum II 8, 3.

<sup>6</sup> Philo, Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit 91, tr. F. H. Colson Loeb (1941), p. 63.

<sup>7</sup> Josephus Bellum Judaicum 8:3 (Loeb 122). To lie about property was a serious offence (IQS 6:24). For a discussion concerning

desire to promote brotherly love (*φιλανθρωπίας ἡμερον*).<sup>1</sup> In the Rule of the Community they are all to "be in true community (*סדן סדן*) and good humility and loyal love (*סדן סדן*) and righteous thought, each for his fellow in the holy council, and they shall be sons of the eternal assembly" (IQS 2:24-25; cf. 5:25; 8:2).<sup>2</sup> Any sins against such a spirit would be severely dealt with (IQS 6:24-7:10). According to Philo those Essenes who did not marry considered marriage with the resulting behaviour and demands of wives and children as the principal danger to the maintenance of *τῆς κοινωρίας*.<sup>3</sup>

Theirs was an ideal of a common life not only in deed but also in spirit, and central in that life was the common meal,<sup>4</sup> entrance to which was the final step to full admission into the communal life.<sup>5</sup> This daily meal was not only an expression of their brotherhood but also definitely cultic in character<sup>6</sup> and eschatological in setting.<sup>7</sup> For in

---

their practice of property cf. Edmund F. Sutcliffe, The Monks of Qumran (London: Burns & Oates, Publishers to the Holy See, 1960), pp. 91-96.

<sup>1</sup>Philo Hypothetica 11:2.

<sup>2</sup>Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 373.

<sup>3</sup>Philo Hypothetica 11:14-17. Cf. Josephus Bellum Judaicum II 8, 4.

<sup>4</sup>Josephus Bellum Judaicum II 8,5; Philo Hypothetica 11, 5, 11; IQS 6:1-6; IQSa 2:17-22.

<sup>5</sup>Josephus Bellum Judaicum II 8, 7. IQS 7:19-20.

<sup>6</sup>Josephus Antiquities XVIII 1, 5, may refer to the meals when he says that they offer sacrifices themselves. This is the opinion of Karl Georg Kuhn, "The Lord's Supper and the Communal Meal at Qumran," The Scrolls and the New Testament, ed. Krister Stendahl (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1958), p. 260, fn. 15. This article, pp. 65-93, is a valuable discussion of the Qumran common meal.

<sup>7</sup>Cf. Cross, pp. 63-67.

the Rule of the Congregation (2:17-22) it is presented as a liturgical anticipation of the messianic banquet (cf. Is. 25:6-8) at which the Messiah of Israel shall preside at the end of days (IQSa 1:1). Here is the supreme expression of their koinonia "quality of life" in its full three-dimensional character--eschatological motif, resultant brotherhood and attendant extreme holiness emphasis.

The last named integral characteristic of their manner of life is due to the priestly character of the community according to which the community strives to live in priestly purity.<sup>1</sup> Those who join are to devote themselves "for holiness (  $\psi\tau\tau\tau\tau$  ) in Aaron" (IQS 5:6) and "for a holy community" (  $\psi\tau\tau\tau\tau\tau\tau$  ) (IQS 9:2; cf. 5:20). "The men of the community (  $\tau\tau\tau\tau\tau\tau$  ) shall be set apart, a house of holiness for Aaron, to be united as a holy of holies and a house of community for Israel, those who conduct themselves blamelessly" (IQS 9:5-6).<sup>2</sup> They are to live in submission to "the sons of Zadok, the priests who keep the covenant" (IQS 5:2) who "have control over judgment and property" (IQS 9:7). Great care was taken to maintain their state of holiness, even within the ranks of the community. For their emphasis on purity and the supremacy of the priesthood led to rank in these matters within the community (IQS 7:19-23). In fact to keep in the proper station was to be "in true community" (  $\psi\tau\tau\tau\tau\tau\tau$  ) (IQS 2:23-25). This concern for holiness<sup>3</sup> which so permeated the community had definite

---

<sup>1</sup>Kuhn, "The Lord's Supper and the Communal Meal at Qumran," p. 68.

<sup>2</sup>Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 383.

<sup>3</sup>For a detailed discussion of this aspect cf. Frederick Nötscher, "Heiligkeit in den Qumranschriften," Revue de Qumran 6 (February 1960), pp. 163-182, 7 (June 1960), pp. 315-344.



ethical implications as is evidenced by their doctrine of two spirits (IQS 3:13-4:26).

In summary the koinonia of Qumran was the koinonia of Judaism in an extreme sectarian expression, for the Law remained supreme. With Cross<sup>1</sup> it can be thought of as a Heilsgemeinschaft, a sharing of life based on the imminent expectation of a new age of God, resulting in a unique human unity and accompanied by a very acute awareness of the holy with its ethical implications. The similarity in outline to the New Testament is inescapable. Here are anticipations that can be conceived of as praeparatio evangelica.<sup>2</sup>

E/ The fascinating "togetherness" of the Essenes, extending even to the community of goods, had its immediate rationale in the "perfecting of the way," that is, that obedience to the Law and maintenance of the state of ritual and ethical holiness which would permit them to play their chosen and definitive role in the near approaching kingdom. This they were convinced they could only accomplish communally under the direction of the Zadok priests and in isolation from all those who shared neither their views nor disposition to such disciplined living. The underlying motive of their koinonia was certainly eschatological, but its peculiar character roots more directly in the manner of their response to the eschatological situation in which they believed themselves to be.

The language of Philo and Josephus.---Before closing this discussion of Judaism it will be of value to point out the ideas involved in the

---

<sup>1</sup>Cross, p. 56.

<sup>2</sup>Hans Kosmala, Hebräer - Essener - Christen, Vol. I of Studia Post-Biblica, ed. P. A. H. De Boer (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959), p. ix.

use of koinonia by Philo and Josephus--Jewish writers of the period who wrote in Greek.

3/ Philo's use of koinonia to characterize the communal life of the Essenes has already been indicated. Similarly of the Therapeutae, a Jewish monastic group possible/ akin to the Essenes,<sup>1</sup> he can write that their reason for not dwelling far apart is that they ἀσπάζονται κοινωρίαν.<sup>2</sup> Koinonia is used very commonly by him to designate the relations between men in various connections in reference both to the actual relationship<sup>3</sup> and as a character trait.<sup>4</sup> Included naturally is the marriage relationship.<sup>5</sup> He ascribes man's capacity for koinonia to his possession of λόγος<sup>6</sup> or a λογικὴν ψυχὴν.<sup>7</sup>

More significant is his application in Hellenistic fashion of koinonia to a man's relationship to god: "Again was not the joy of his partnership with the Father and maker of all (τῆς πρὸς τὸν πατέρα τῶν ὅλων καὶ ποιητὴν κοινωρίας) magnified also by the honor

<sup>1</sup>Erwin R. Goodenough, An Introduction to Philo Judaeus (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940), p. 36. Cf. Burrows, More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls, pp. 109, 269, 368. See above p. 151, fn. 1.

<sup>2</sup>Philo De Vita Contemplativa 24.

<sup>3</sup>Philo Legum Allegoriarum I 8: κοινωρίας καὶ ἐνώσεως . Cf. De Ebrietate 78, 84; De Specialibus Legibus II 7, 324; III 103; De Decalogo 14, 132, 324.

<sup>4</sup>Philo De Virtutibus 80, 84; De Sacrificiis Abelis et Caini 27: συνεῖποντο δὲ αὐτῇ εὐσεβείᾳ δεισιότης ἀλήθεια θέμις ἀγιοτεία εὐορκία δικαιοσύνη ἰσότης εὐσυνθεσία κοινωρία ἔχε θυμία σωφροσύνη.

<sup>5</sup>Philo De Specialibus Legibus I, 109; De Congressu Eurydictionis Gratia 121; De Abrahamo 100; De Opificio Mundi 152.

<sup>6</sup>Philo De Decalogo 132.

<sup>7</sup>Philo De Specialibus Legibus III 103.

of being deemed worthy to bear the same title?"<sup>1</sup> In a similar manner koinonos is employed for the same relationship as it is expressed in the cult.<sup>2</sup>

He does not hesitate to speak of the koinonia of all created things<sup>3</sup> and ascribes to Moses a belief *ἐν τοῖς μέρεσι κοινωρίας καὶ συμμαθείας* of the κόσμος.<sup>4</sup> Philo also commonly refers to the parts of the human body in their mutual relation forming a complete whole in phrases like *ἡ κοινωρία τῶν τοῦ σώματος μερῶν*<sup>5</sup> and its variations.<sup>6</sup> Finally he can write of a *κοινωρίας νόμων τε καὶ ἔθων*.<sup>7</sup>

Josephus does not manifest as wide a range of usage as Philo, for he limits his application of koinonia to the level of human relationship or partnership in the various spheres of life in an ordinary Greek manner.<sup>8</sup> He can speak of the regulations of the law as *τὴν πρὸς ἀλλήλους ὁμῶν συρέχει κοινωρίαν*.<sup>9</sup> Also for him koinonia may be a trait or attitude which men can observe towards one another.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Philo De Vita Mosis I 158, tr. F. H. Colson, Loeb (1935), p. 357.

<sup>2</sup>Philo De Specialibus Legibus 221.

<sup>3</sup>Philo De Cherubim 110.

<sup>4</sup>Philo De Migratione Abrahami 180. Cf. 178.

<sup>5</sup>Philo De Decalogo 71; cf. De Specialibus Legibus V 83.

<sup>6</sup>Philo De Sacrificiis Abelis et Caini 75; De Decalogo 150; De Abrahamo 17; De Josepho 160.

<sup>7</sup>Philo De Specialibus Legibus IV 16. Cf. De Vita Mosis I 324.

<sup>8</sup>Josephus Antiquities I 304; II 62; Contra Apionem I 35.

<sup>9</sup>Josephus Contra Apionem II 208.

<sup>10</sup>Josephus Bellum Judaicum II 264: *τὴν πρὸς ἀρθρῶν καὶ ἡμερότητα καὶ κοινωρίαν*.



Although summary statements have been made occasionally throughout the preceding consideration of the background of the New Testament concept of koinonia in Judaism, a few concluding observations may be of value. As in the Old Testament the fundamental concept within which to view any koinonia "quality of life" is the historic Covenant of God with Israel. But now a shift in emphasis has come in the manner in which it is manifested in the life and hope of the people. Historical conditions have brought about a Law-religion as the proper content of the Covenant-life and as the necessary pre-requisite of the fulfilment of the Covenant-hope. The cult, in particular the Passover, continued as an important expression of their life together in the Covenant in all its facets. Due, however, to the supremacy of the Law over the Temple in the religious life of the people, there came a sense of individual responsibility, which, with its differing interpretations, applications and ability to observe the Law, made for a separation of Jew from Jew in terms of what each felt was a more faithful realization of the Covenant life and hope. Thus one can speak not only of the Covenant koinonia of the whole Israelite community but also, as has been shown, of that of the Pharisees and of the Essenes each differing in degrees from the other. One can say generally that any koinonia "quality of life" in Judaism was qualified by a rigid adherence to the Law, conditioned by an acute though complex eschatological hope and characterized by a heightened awareness of the ritual holy which both intensified and destroyed a sense of koinonia.

---

## CHAPTER IV

### ANTECEDENTS OF KOINONIA IN THE LIFE AND MINISTRY OF JESUS

The purpose of this study is the elucidation of the koinonia "quality of life" which has been seen to be witnessed to by the koinonia language of the New Testament. In the foregoing chapter the anticipations of this koinonia apart from the New Testament revelation were briefly sketched. Before becoming concerned with the further development of this concept it is vital that these anticipations be further traced in the direct antecedents of koinonia in the life and ministry of Jesus. The New Testament koinonia "quality of life" cannot be appreciated, understood or accounted for apart from its causal rootage in the person and work of Jesus of Nazareth.

Due to the character of John's Gospel as a *πνευματικόν* . . . εὐαγγέλιον<sup>1</sup>--that is to say in modern terminology, it speaks of Jesus "more self-consciously and explicitly . . . in terms of the kerigma,"<sup>2</sup> and is "the product of a developed theological reflection"<sup>3</sup>--the Synoptics will be the primary sources for the present task. As

---

<sup>1</sup>The characterization of Clement of Alexandria as reported by Eusebius, The Ecclesiastical History, tr. J. F. Oulton, Loeb (1932), VI, xiv, 7.

<sup>2</sup>James M. Robinson, A New Quest of the Historical Jesus, Studies in Biblical Theology No. 25 (London: SCM Press, 1959), p. 54.

<sup>3</sup>Günther Bornkamm, Jesus of Nazareth, tr. Irene and Fraser McLuskey with James Robinson (London: Hodder and Stoughton, (1960), p. 14.

A. M. Hunter observes, there is no essential difference between John and the Synoptics in theme and story, but "a difference of style, of atmosphere, and of treatment."<sup>1</sup> The Synoptics, therefore, can better take one back into the thought world of Jesus' own life and times, though they too partake of the nature of the kerygma.<sup>2</sup> A second justification for considering John's Gospel only as a secondary source is that the characteristic Johannine conception of koinonia is to be the object of consideration in a subsequent chapter.

### The Eschatological Role of Jesus

The hope of the Kingdom and Jesus.--The preceding chapter has shown that the historical-religious rootage of the koinonia concept lies in the Covenant relationship which God established with Israel. Out of this relationship and the progressive failure of Israel fully to maintain and realize the Covenant ideal there arose in Israel's history the hope of a renewed and restored Covenant, under the conditions of which the koinonia "quality of life" could be fully manifested. This hope was an integral part of the expectation of the Kingship or Sovereignty of God (Is. 24:23; 52:7; Obad. 21; Zeph. 3:15; Zech. 14:9; cf. Dan. 7:13-27)<sup>3</sup> which by New Testament times had become an eschatological entity to

<sup>1</sup>A. M. Hunter, Introducing the New Testament (2nd. ed.; London: SCM Press, 1957), pp. 64f.

<sup>2</sup>James M. Robinson, pp. 35-43. This approach, however, can be and has been carried too far when it is maintained that "history survived only as kerygma," for other motifs were surely operative as well.

<sup>3</sup>Gerhard Von Rad, "Melek and Malkuth in the O.T.," Basileia, Bible Key Words, tr. H. P. Kingdom (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1957), pp. 4-14. Cf. Otto, pp. 13-47.



be effected in a coming age ( $\alpha\lambda\omega\rho$ ) displacing the present world-age.<sup>1</sup>

In one form or another the expectation of this new Reign of God was prevalent in the Jewish faith of Jesus' day (Lk. 2:25) as was witnessed

by the ready hearing<sup>2</sup> given to the startling proclamation of John the

Baptist:  $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\nu\omicron\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon$ .  $\eta\gamma\gamma\iota\kappa\epsilon\upsilon$  γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν

<sup>3</sup> (Mt. 3:2). Thus when Jesus focuses his preaching upon the same

theme:  $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\nu\omicron\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon$ .  $\eta\gamma\gamma\iota\kappa\epsilon\upsilon$  γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν

<sup>4</sup> (Mt. 4:17; cf. Mk. 1:15); he relates himself in an organic manner to the historic Covenant faith and hope of Israel. The hope of the Old Testament and the expectation of his people becomes the content of his life and ministry. The immediate foundations of the New Testament concept of koinonia in line with what has been observed in the previous chapter are to be found then in Jesus' proclamation of the Kingdom of God.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Volz, pp. 165-173.

<sup>2</sup>Mk. 1:5; Mt. 3:5; Lk. 3:3.

<sup>3</sup>The Jewish expression is  $\text{מְלִיכְוֹתָא דְּיְהוָה}$  in Aramaic and  $\text{מְלִיכְוֹתָא דְּיְהוָה}$  in Hebrew and means "the sovereignty of the transcendent God." Dalman, The Words of Jesus, pp. 91-93. Cf. Karl Georg Kuhn, "Malkūth Shāmayim in Rabbinic Literature," Basileia, Bible Key Words, tr. H. P. Kingdom (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1957), pp. 15-21. He concludes: "Thus malkūth shāmayim is obviously, in the theology of late Judaism, a purely eschatological phrase, in the strictest sense of that word." p. 19.

<sup>4</sup>For the relation of this verse to Mt. 3:2 cf. A. Schlatter, Der Evangelist Matthäus (3rd ed.; Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1948), p. 116.

<sup>5</sup> $\eta\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\iota\alpha\tau\omicron\upsilon\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$  (Mk., Lk.) is the correct rendering in Greek of the Hebrew or Aramaic phrase which Matthew literally translated as  $\eta\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\iota\alpha\tau\omicron\upsilon\omega\upsilon\rho\alpha\nu\omega\nu$ . Kuhn, "Malkūth Shāmayim in Rabbinic Literature," p. 16.

Jesus and the proclamation of the Kingdom of God.--Jesus'

preaching of the Kingdom of God or "royal sovereignty"<sup>1</sup> was thus distinctly eschatological. For while he shares with the Old Testament (Is. 41:21; 43:15; Jer. 10:7; Ps. 145:11-13) and later Judaism<sup>2</sup> the conviction that God is even now "the great King" (Mt. 5:35; cf. 11:25), when he speaks of the Kingdom of God<sup>3</sup> it is in terms of a decisive manifestation of God's kingship in fulfilment of the past and present hope of Israel:<sup>4</sup> "Now after John was arrested, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of God, and saying, *πεντήρωται ὁ καιρὸς καὶ ἡγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ* (Mk. 1:14-15).<sup>7</sup>

Jesus preached the Kingdom of God as effective in his own life and ministry: *ἡγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ* (Mk. 1:15; cf.

<sup>1</sup>Karl Ludwig Schmidt, "Basileus and its Correlates in the N.T.," *Basileia, Bible Key Words*, tr. H. P. Kingdom (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1957), p. 43. This is the primary, though not exclusive, meaning of the term in the teaching of Jesus.

<sup>2</sup>Volz, p. 165.

<sup>3</sup>Dalman, *The Words of Jesus*, p. 135, concludes that the parallels from Jewish literature prove "that the true affinity of the idea of the sovereignty as taught by Jesus, is to be found, not so much in the Jewish conception of *מְלָכּוּת* as in the idea of the 'future age' (*עוֹלָם הַבָּא*), or that of the 'life of the future age' (*חַיַּת עוֹלָם הַבָּא*). Cf. his discussion on pp. 106-110.

<sup>4</sup>C. E. B. Cranfield, *The Gospel According to Saint Mark*, Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary, ed. C. F. D. Moule (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1959), p. 65.

<sup>5</sup>Cf. D. Gerhard Delling, "ἐληρώω," *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, ed. Gerhard Friedrich (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1959), VI, 293.

<sup>6</sup>Cullmann, *Christ and Time*, pp. 37-44.

<sup>7</sup>For a discussion of the eschatological motifs in the Markan introduction cf. James M. Robinson, *The Problem of History in Mark*, (London: SCM Press, 1957), pp. 21-32.

Mt. 10:7; Lk. 10:9). Although recent criticism has demonstrated the inappropriateness of C. H. Dodd's translation of "has come"<sup>1</sup> in favour of "has drawn near,"<sup>2</sup> the difference is not great, for the verb is perhaps best understood in a spatial (cf. Mk. 11:1; 14:42; 12:34) rather than in a temporal sense: "the Kingdom of God has come close to men in the person of Jesus, and in his person it actually confronts them"<sup>3</sup> (Lk. 17:21; 11:20; cf. Mt. 12:28). The fact that Jesus can also refer to the Kingdom as a future event (Mk. 9:1; 14:25; Mt. 8:11; 6:10; Lk. 11:2; 22:16; 22:29f.) does not invalidate the presence of the Kingdom in himself, but as Kümmel has demonstrated, it illustrates the particular quality of Jesus' eschatology.<sup>4</sup> On the basis of Mark 8:38, Matthew 19:28 and Luke 12:32 (cf. Mk. 2:19; Lk. 17:20f.; 24:26) Kümmel shows that the future eschatological action of God was already being fulfilled in Jesus. Jesus' presence was "a real eschatological present."<sup>5</sup> That is, the attitude taken toward Jesus in the present decides the verdict in the final eschatological judgement: "therefore adherence to the man Jesus means adherence to the coming Kingdom of God at work in advance

---

<sup>1</sup>C. H. Dodd, The Parables of the Kingdom (3rd ed.; London: Nisbet and Co., Ltd., 1936), p. 44.

<sup>2</sup>J. Y. Campbell, "The Kingdom of God has come," Expository Times XLVIII (1936-1937), pp. 91-94. K. Clark, "Realized Eschatology," Journal of Biblical Literature LIX (1940), pp. 367-374. Vincent Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark (London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1952), pp. 166-167. Cf. Reginald H. Fuller, The Mission and Achievement of Jesus (London: SCM Press, 1954), pp. 20-25. Werner Georg Kümmel, Promise and Fulfilment, tr. Dorothea M. Barton (London: SCM Press, 1957), pp. 19-24.

<sup>3</sup>Cranfield, The Gospel According to Saint Mark, p. 68.

<sup>4</sup>Kümmel, pp. 141-155.

<sup>5</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 153. Cf. pp. 36-48.



already in the present."<sup>1</sup> The Kingdom, though in a real sense hidden (Mk. 4:11)<sup>2</sup>, was effectively present in Jesus' confrontation of men in his person. He is the Kingdom itself (αὐτοβασιλεία)<sup>3</sup>; in him as in his parables there resides "an eschatology that is in the process of realization"<sup>4</sup> which compels men to come to a decision about his person and mission.

Further, it was as the messianic head of the eschatological people of God that Jesus proclaimed the Kingdom. In spite of a radical handling of the Gospel tradition by some<sup>5</sup> it has been shown with a fair degree of certainty that Jesus with the aid of the enigmatic Son of Man figure (Dan. 7:13)<sup>6</sup> reinterpreted the current messianic idea(s) along the lines of the Suffering Servant of Deutero-Isaiah.<sup>7</sup> And while Jesus

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 154. Cf. pp. 105-140 for his further exposition of this "present."

<sup>2</sup>On this verse cf. A. M. Hunter, Interpreting the Parables (London: SCM Press, 1960), pp. 110-112.

<sup>3</sup>Origen, Matthew Commentary, xiv. 7. Cited from Schmidt, p. 54.

<sup>4</sup>Joachim Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus, tr. S. H. Hooke (London: SCM Press, 1954), p. 159. Cf. pp. 93ff. for the confirmation in the parables of the main point of the paragraph.

<sup>5</sup>As is evidenced in Bultmann's works and in varying degrees by those who follow after him. Cf. James M. Robinson, A New Quest of the Historical Jesus, pp. 9-25.

<sup>6</sup>Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, pp. 137-164. For the present state of research on the problem, cf. A. J. B. Higgins, "Son of Man-Forschung since 'The Teaching of Jesus'," pp. 119-135.

<sup>7</sup>William Manson, Jesus the Messiah (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1943), pp. 94ff. T. W. Manson, The Servant-Messiah (Cambridge: at the University Press, 1953). Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, pp. 51-82. For recent denials of Jesus' identification of his mission with that of the Servant of the Songs cf. Morna D. Hooker, Jesus and the Servant (London: S. P. C. K., 1959), pp. 62-102. C. K. Barrett, "The Background

showed considerable reserve in respect to the title *Χριστός* (Mk. 14: 61-62, Mt. 26:63-64; Lk. 22:67-69; cf. Mk. 15:2 and parallels) he did not directly reject it. It was the Jewish understanding of the title which he rejected as is particularly manifest in Mark 8:27ff. and parallels. But as Cullmann points out, Jesus thought of his task as that of carrying out the role of Israel, thus "the possibility of interpreting his attitude toward the messianic description at this one point as one of consent."<sup>1</sup> Even apart from the problem of Jesus' application of messianic titles to himself, the messianic character of Jesus' mission is evident from the work and words of his ministry.<sup>2</sup> Can one then proceed to affirm that Jesus in his messianic proclamation of the Kingdom was instituting an eschatological community--a people who partake of the messianic age? This is a question apart from the fascinating twin concerns of the precise moment of the founding of the Church<sup>3</sup> and the extent to which the Kingdom was effective in the lives of those who surrounded Jesus in his lifetime. Rather the issue is the messianic-eschatological significance of the acceptance of Jesus and his message by the people of his day. Important indications are the collective

---

of Mark 10:45," New Testament Essays, ed. A. J. B. Higgins (Manchester: The University Press, 1959), pp. 1-18, and Bornkamm, Jesus of Nazareth, pp. 226ff.

<sup>1</sup>Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, pp. 117-127: "there is at least one aspect of the Jewish conception of the Messiah which we can reconcile with Jesus' consciousness of his calling: . . . the fact that the Messiah fulfils the task of Israel. The Jewish conception of how he does this is not applicable to Jesus."

<sup>2</sup>Fuller, p. 116. His designation of "pre-Messianic" over against Bultmann's "un-Messianic" as the character of the life of Jesus reveals the essentiality of the messianic category for an understanding of the life of Jesus even when the titles are denied him by radical criticism. Bornkamm, Jesus of Nazareth,

implications of the figures of the Son of Man and the Servant<sup>1</sup> and the Old Testament idea of the Remnant (Mic. 4:4-7; Is. 7:3; Lk. 12:32; cf. Mic. 5:4; Is. 40:11; Ezek. 34:12-24; Psalms of Solomon 17:45)<sup>2</sup> all of which are pointed up in Jesus' life and ministry. To this can be added the established fact that the Rule of God as Jesus preached it implied a community.<sup>3</sup> For it can be seen with Kümmel that the eschatological implications of the relation of men to Jesus as one in whom the Kingdom is effectively present attach to those who respond to him the very significance of his life and ministry. He concludes:

So not only is the personal confession or denial of Jesus in question, but it is assumed that a group of men has gathered round this Jesus, which derives its significance entirely from its relation to Jesus, and just for that reason receives an eschatological promise.<sup>4</sup>

Thus Jesus' messianic proclamation of the Rule of God was giving rise to the sphere of that Rule--an eschatological sphere of God.<sup>5</sup>

Finally, it must be seen that Jesus in his proclamation of the

---

pp. 169-173, does not deny the messianic character of Jesus' ministry, only the messianic consciousness.

<sup>3</sup>For the possibilities cf. George Johnston, The Doctrine of the Church In the New Testament (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1943), pp. 46f.

<sup>1</sup>This is only to assert that these figures cannot be isolated from their collective connotations and not to deny that the application may be individual as well.

<sup>2</sup>Flew, pp. 49-54.

<sup>3</sup>Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark, p. 114. Cf. Dalman, The Words of Jesus, pp. 110-133, Flew, pp. 23-40.

<sup>4</sup>Kümmel, p. 48. Cf. James Robinson, The Problem of History in Mark, pp. 79ff.

<sup>5</sup>For the bearing of Mt. 16:18 on this point cf. Karl Ludwig Schmidt, The Church, Bible Key Words, tr. J. R. Coates (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1950), pp. 35-50, and Flew, pp. 123-136.



Kingdom viewed the events of his passion as indispensable to the coming of the Kingdom *ἐν δυνάμει* (Mk. 9:1).<sup>1</sup> With the confession of Peter at Caesarea Philippi (Mk. 8:27-33; Mt. 16:13-16; Lk. 9:18-20) which marked a turning point in his ministry<sup>2</sup> Jesus began more ostensibly to interpret his mission to the disciples in terms of the necessity of messianic suffering (Mk. 8:31; 9:12, 31; 10:33-34; 10:45<sup>3</sup>). According to Fuller, Jesus' interpretation of his death in the foregoing verses as being in fulfilment of the mission of the Servant is brought by Luke 12:49-50 "directly into relation with the proclamation of the coming Reign of God"<sup>4</sup> with the conclusion that "the ministry of Jesus is therefore not exhausted in the proclamation of the coming Reign of God. It is his destiny also to accomplish the event by which that Reign should be inaugurated."<sup>5</sup> At the Last Supper which Jesus celebrates with his disciples in view both to his approaching death and the coming Kingdom Jesus places his death in the context of the Covenant<sup>6</sup> (Mk. 14:24;

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Vincent Taylor, Jesus and His Sacrifice (London: Macmillan and Co., 1937), pp. 79-273; William Manson, pp. 121-148; Fuller, pp. 50-78; A. M. Hunter, The Work and Words of Jesus (London: SCM Press, 1950), pp. 91-100.

<sup>2</sup>Particularly is this true of the Markan order. Cf. Fuller, pp. 51-55. Cf. also T. W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus (2nd ed.; Cambridge: At the University Press, 1935), pp. 129-130.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. the exegesis of this verse by W. Manson, pp. 131-134. But for a different position cf. C. K. Barrett, "The background of Mark 10:45," pp. 1-18.

<sup>4</sup>Fuller, p. 62.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid. Vincent Taylor, Jesus and His Sacrifice, p. 258, on the basis of the passion sayings in all four Gospels concludes that they imply that "in fulfilling His Messianic vocation, Jesus thought of His Passion as closely connected with the Kingdom of God."

<sup>6</sup>Otto, pp. 289-295, points out the relation of the covenant

Lk. 22:20; Mt. 26:28; I Cor. 11:25)<sup>1</sup> which portrays that death as an imperative for the fulfilment of the Covenant hope of the Kingdom. This relating by Jesus of the very essence of his ministry to the historic concept of the Covenant points up his importance for the New Testament koinonia, for "Jesus steps into the place of the ancient sacrifices of Israel. He represents the fullness, the consummation of sacrifice, by which the new covenant is inaugurated."<sup>2</sup> The eschatological setting of the Last Supper is indicated by Mark 14:25 (Lk. 22:18; Mt. 26:29; cf. I Cor. 11:26) in which Jesus anticipates the messianic banquet at the consummation of the Kingdom (Mt. 8:11; Lk. 14:15; 22:29-30; Rev. 19:9).<sup>3</sup> The impending events of his death and resurrection (Mk. 8:31; 9:31; 10:23f.) are indispensable to the coming of the Kingdom "in power" (Mk. 9:1; cf. Mt. 16:28; Lk. 8:27).<sup>4</sup>

motif in the Last Supper to the coming Kingdom.

<sup>1</sup>Ex. 24:1-11; Jer. 31:31-34; Zech. 9:11; Is. 53:12. For the genuineness of the Covenant saying cf. Taylor, Jesus and His Sacrifice, 125-139, and Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, 110-115.

<sup>2</sup>W. Manson, p. 145, who follows Vincent Taylor's interpretation of the Covenant word on Jesus' lips in terms of Ex. 24:1-11 noting that "as of old dedicated blood was applied in blessing to the people of Israel, so now His life, surrendered to God and accepted by Him, is offered to, and made available for men." Jesus and His Sacrifice, p. 138.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Isaiah 25:6; I Enoch 62:14; 2 Baruch 19:5ff.; IV Ezra 6:51ff.; Pirge Aboth 3:20; Strack-Billerbeck, I, 992, IV, 1154-1165. It is possible with Cranfield, The Gospel According to Saint Mark, p. 428, to interpret this as a Nazirite vow (Num. 6:1-21) which would end with the reunion of Jesus with his disciples after the resurrection and before the ascension (Acts 10:41; 1:4, Lk. 24:30-35). Cf. his interpretation of 9:1 in footnote 4 below.

<sup>4</sup>On this verse cf. Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark, pp. 384-386; Kümmel, p. 25-28; Cranfield, The Gospel According to Saint Mark, pp. 285-289. The latter applies the saying to

The coming Reign of God--the eschatological fulfilment of the Covenant hope of Israel--was inseparably bound up in all that Jesus was and did--even unto death and beyond.<sup>1</sup> The New Testament still awaits the full consummation of the Kingdom at the parousia. It does witness, however, to a fuller recognition and realization of that Rule in the gift of the Spirit to the disciples (Lk. 24:49; Acts 1:6-8; 2:1-4; Jn. 20:22-23) which is integral to the koinonia reality of the New Testament (Acts 2:42).<sup>2</sup> Kümmel has convincingly demonstrated that although Jesus did expect an early consummation of the Kingdom, he did not identify his resurrection and the parousia and expected an interval between them.<sup>3</sup> Thus to round out this sketch of the eschatological role of Jesus there is need for a brief look at his role in respect to the Holy Spirit in its connection with the coming of the Kingdom "in power."

The eschatological role of Jesus and the Spirit.--The (Holy) Spirit in both the Old Testament and Judaism bore an eschatological significance. Most relevant for the New Testament and the present concern is the Old Testament view of the Spirit of God<sup>4</sup> as "the concept for the activity of the one and only God in history and creation."<sup>5</sup> In the

---

the transfiguration in which both the resurrection and the parousia may be said to be proleptically present. The former two refer it to the consummation.

<sup>1</sup>Bornkamm, Jesus of Nazareth, p. 179, "The story of Jesus does not end with his death. It begins anew with his resurrection."

<sup>2</sup>See above pp. 1

<sup>3</sup>Kümmel, pp. 19-89. Cf. Otto, pp. 59-62.

<sup>4</sup>The Old Testament never speaks solely of the "Holy Spirit" but does twice refer to "God's Holy Spirit" (Ps. 51:11; Is. 63:10).

<sup>5</sup>Friedrich Baumgärtel in E. Schweizer, Spirit of God, Bible Key



prophets this concept of the Spirit of God became characteristic of the last days when God would act in a new and fuller way in Israel. At that time the Messiah would be the bearer of the Spirit (Is. 11:2; 42:1; cf. 61:1); then would God cause the Spirit to be poured out on every member of the renewed Israel (Is. 32:15; 44:3; (Jer. 31:33f.); Ezek. 11:19; 36:26f; 37:14; Zech. 12:10; Joel 2:28f.), and there would come to pass that which was now only the object of pious yearning (Num. 11:29).<sup>1</sup> At this point it should be noticed too that the Spirit is presented as the guarantee of God's faithfulness to his Covenant (Is. 59:21). In Judaism the Spirit of God was even more exclusively linked with the coming age.<sup>2</sup> Again a distinct connection with the Messiah is in evidence<sup>3</sup> (I Enoch 49:3 on Is. 11:1f.; 62:2; Psalms of Solomon 17:42; 18:7; Testament of Levi 18:2-14; Testament of Judah 24:2; CDC 2:10; IQS 4:20ff., cf. 9:3ff.<sup>4</sup>),

---

Words, tr. A. E. Harvey (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1960), p. 5. For the more precise documentation of the Old Testament concept of Spirit which was omitted from the translation see the original article in Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. Gerhard Friedrich (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1959), VI, 357-363, or Köhler, pp. 95ff.

<sup>1</sup>E. Schweizer, "Gegenwart des Geistes und eschatologische Hoffnung," pp. 482-483.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., pp. 483-484. Erich Sjöberg, "Geist im Judentum," in "Πνεῦμα, πνευματικός," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. Gerhard Friedrich (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1959), VI, 373-387, cites the Rabbinic evidence.

<sup>3</sup>C. K. Barrett, The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition (London: S. P. C. K., 1947), pp. 42-45.

<sup>4</sup>IQS 4:20f. is the only reference in the Dead Sea Scrolls in which the Spirit is ascribed a strictly eschatological significance. W. D. Davies, "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Flesh and Spirit," pp. 173f. E. Schweizer, "Gegenwart des Geistes und eschatologische Hoffnung," p. 490, concludes that the Spirit in the Dead Sea Scrolls "ist fast ausschliesslich Phänomen der Kampfzeit, in der der Mensch in der Wahl zwischen Gut und Böse steht."

and in the last age the righteous are to receive the Spirit of God (Testament of Judah 24:3; Testament of Levi 18:11).<sup>1</sup> In the Rabbinical literature more than in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha the presence of the Spirit (God's) in the present age was not thought possible.<sup>2</sup> Thus by Jesus' day the eschatological conception of the Spirit was the most dominant and furnishes the stage for the development of the concept of the Holy Spirit which takes place in New Testament times.<sup>3</sup> It is then the eschatological context common to both Jesus and the Spirit that furnishes the means of understanding the relation between them and thereby the historical continuity between Jesus and his Church in respect to the Holy Spirit.<sup>4</sup>

The Synoptic Gospels portray the eschatological presence of the Spirit upon Jesus. In Matthew and Mark particularly is the Old Testament concept of Spirit as God's power or activity determinative.<sup>5</sup> Jesus very probably uses the concept to express the presence of the Kingdom in himself: "But if it is by the Spirit (Lk. 11:20 reads "finger") of God that I cast out demons, then the Kingdom of God has come upon you"

---

<sup>1</sup>Barrett, The Holy Spirit in the Gospel Tradition, p. 21f.

<sup>2</sup>Sjöberg, pp. 383f.

<sup>3</sup>Richardson, pp. 105f.

<sup>4</sup>Barrett, The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition, p. 4, pursues this theme and demonstrates its validity in an attempt to account for the infrequent reference to the Holy Spirit in the Synoptic tradition especially in Matthew and Mark. Luke uses Πνεῦμα for the divine Spirit at least three times as often as Mark because of his preoccupation with the question of the possession of the Holy Spirit by the early Christian community. Cf. E. Schweizer, "Gegenwart des Geistes und eschatologische Hoffnung," p. 502ff.

<sup>5</sup>E. Schweizer, Spirit of God, p. 25.

(Mt. 12:28).<sup>1</sup> This eschatological connection of the Spirit with Jesus is clearly shown in his baptism by John which cannot be understood otherwise than as an account of the endowment of the Holy Spirit upon the Messiah in fulfilment of the messianic conception that the work of the Spirit was to inaugurate the ministry of the Messiah.<sup>2</sup> Thus the presence of the Spirit of God in Jesus' ministry was an integral part of his Messiahship and was concealed with it. This accounts in part for Jesus' relative silence, for to declare his unique relation to the Spirit of God would be to declare his Messiahship--a form which he was remoulding in terms of a suffering Son of Man (Mk. 8:31).<sup>3</sup> The presence of the Spirit upon Jesus--"his 'eschatological' status, the fact that God is really present with him as he is nowhere else"<sup>4</sup>--is clearly subordinated in Jesus' ministry to the dawning in him of the messianic Last Age. This is evident not only in the Spirit passages (Mk. 1:8, 10; 3:28-30; 13:11; Mt. 1:20; 12:18)<sup>5</sup> but also in the fact of the eschatol-

<sup>1</sup>Although most scholars seem to prefer Luke's reading here as the original form of the saying (so T. W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus, pp. 82f. and Barrett, The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition, pp. 62ff., but cf. Richardson, p. 107,) there is no real difference in meaning.

<sup>2</sup>Barrett, The Holy Spirit in the Gospel Tradition, pp. 25-45. E. Schweizer, Spirit of God, pp. 29f. The role of the Spirit in the conception of Jesus can be viewed in a similar manner--"the fulfilment of God's promised redemption in a new act of creation." Barrett, The Holy Spirit in the Gospel Tradition, pp. 23f. Cf. H. B. Swete, The Holy Spirit in the New Testament (London: Macmillan and Co., 1909-1919), pp. 23-49.

<sup>3</sup>Barrett, The Holy Spirit in the Gospel Tradition, p. 119.

<sup>4</sup>E. Schweizer, Spirit of God, p. 35.

<sup>5</sup>Luke, owing to his greater concern with the problem of the Holy Spirit than that of the other Synoptists, is much more open in his presentation of Jesus as one who is in full possession of the Holy Spirit (Lk. 4:1, 14, 18; 10:21; compare the context of



ological activity of God in Jesus which was at the same time revealed and concealed in Jesus' miracles and exorcisms as well as in the temptation and the transfiguration.<sup>1</sup> The Spirit then, as participating in the messianic secret, was present in Jesus' ministry as God's power instrumental in the ushering in of the eschatological Kingdom. The eschatological role of the Spirit was subordinate to that of Jesus himself, but it was that common role which demonstrates the link between the early Church's experience of the Holy Spirit and Jesus as the bearer of the Spirit of God.

The manifestation of the Spirit in the early Church is in direct continuity with the eschatological significance of Jesus' own life and ministry. This significance, as it has been pointed out, is indispensably inclusive of the events of Jesus' death and resurrection (Mk. 8:31; 9:31; 10:23f.) for its implementation.<sup>2</sup> According to the record in Acts the primitive Church saw their experience of the Holy Spirit both in an eschatological context (Acts 1:3-5; 2:16-21; 3:19-25) and in direct relation to their risen Lord (Acts 2:32-33; cf. Lk. 24:49; Acts 1:3-8). After Pentecost then the Kingdom still resides in the person of Jesus,<sup>3</sup> only now he comes to the Church in the experience of the Holy Spirit making the presence of the Kingdom not only effective in his person but now also effective in a new way in the lives of his fol-

---

12:10 with that of Mk. 3:29). Cf. E. Schweizer, Spirit of God, pp. 36ff., and "Gegenwart des Geistes und eschatologische Hoffnung," pp. 502ff.

<sup>1</sup>cf. Barrett, The Holy Spirit in the Gospel Tradition, pp. 46-93.

<sup>2</sup>Johnston, p. 57.

<sup>3</sup>As Schmidt, p. 54, points out: "the apostolic and post-apostolic Church of the N.T. did not speak often explicitly of

owers.<sup>1</sup> The consummation of the Kingdom in the cosmos lies yet in the

of the basileia tou theou, but always implicitly stressed this basileia by pointing to the kurios Iesous Christos. It is not the case that the emphasis on the Church has supplanted Jesus of Nazareth's preaching of the Kingdom of God. Rather it is the case that in the post-Easter experience of Christ the belief in the Kingdom of God remained firm."

<sup>1</sup>This is the general New Testament teaching even apart from the question of whether Jesus actually looked forward to the existence of a community endowed with the gift of the Spirit. Barrett (The Holy Spirit in the Gospel Tradition, p. 135) concludes that there is no evidence for such. It is to be questioned, however, whether such an important consequence of Jesus' life and ministry would have been wholly unanticipated by him even if no certain evidence can be garnered from his authentic sayings for it. On the other hand there may be definite indications. One of the arguments by which Flew makes a strong cumulative case for Jesus' expectation of a community to follow him is that the ethical teaching of Jesus involves an enabling promise of God's power and thus points forward to the gift of the Spirit implied in the last days (pp. 58ff.). His answer to the silence of Jesus, not inconsistent with Barrett's, is that Jesus in his own ministry re-interpreted the Spirit's work for he saw that his disciples needed a richer and profounder interpretation of the Spirit than that which they could gain from the Old Testament with their lack of insight (Ibid., p. 70). For him also it is a part of the messianic secret. As has been observed Kümmel (pp. 19-89) shows that Jesus did expect an interval between his death and final consummation. Lofthouse ("The Holy Spirit in the Acts and the Fourth Gospel," Expository Times LII (1940-1941), pp. 334-336) points out that the emphasis of the Johannine teaching on the Spirit underlies the conception of the Spirit in Acts 1-15 and concludes that the source of that conception must be found in the teaching of Jesus. Only this could adequately account for their interpretation of the startling experience of Pentecost. John is therefore basically correct in his report that shortly before his death Jesus taught his disciples plainly about the Holy Spirit and its relation to his person. One could add that in view of the close connection of the Spirit to the messianic secret, as that was more fully taught to the disciples after the turning point of the ministry, why could not its correlate, the eschatological connection of Jesus with the Spirit, become also a topic of instruction? Further in the light of Mark 1:8 (whose mention of the Spirit there is no necessity to deny; cf. Cranfield, The Gospel According to Saint Mark, pp. 48ff.) on the lips of John the Baptist with whose ministry Jesus linked his own, the Lukan (24:49; Acts 2:33) and Johannine (14:26; 16:7ff.) conception of Jesus as the donor of the Spirit need not have been foreign to Jesus' self-interpretation. It is also

future, but it is present "in power" (Mk. 9:1) in the Church.<sup>1</sup> The Covenant hope, implicit in the eschatological expectations, is now a reality in the lives of those who acknowledge Jesus as Lord and Christ (Acts 2:36).<sup>2</sup>

Thus it is seen that the koinonia "quality of life" with which the present study is concerned is directly dependent upon the eschatological role of Jesus in the salvation-movement of God towards men. As James Denney excels in pointing out, for the men of the New Testament it was not a matter of sharing the faith of Jesus, but a sharing-together in him as the object of faith.<sup>3</sup> The Jesus who touched history in his person stands at the center and as the definitive factor in the New Testament and therefore for the Christian koinonia. With the role of Jesus now set in its proper eschatological perspective, the procedure will be to go back into the earthly ministry to examine the relation of Jesus' followers to him and thereby to each other to illuminate more

possible that Mark 9:1 may at least be inclusive of the gift of the Spirit in the intention of Jesus (Ibid., p. 288; Cf. Richardson, pp. 63-62, 107) and that Mark 13:11 (Cf. Mt. 10:20; Lk. 21:15. The Lukan parallel is interesting, for Luke who more than any of the Synoptists reads the early Church's experience of the Holy Spirit back into his Gospel reads "I will give you a mouth and wisdom, . . ." This intimates how closely he linked Jesus and the Spirit.) may have reference to the future gift of the Spirit (Richardson, p. 109. E. Schweizer, Spirit of God, p. 33, considers this the only Spirit saying that can be traced with any certainty to Jesus.).

<sup>1</sup>E. Schweizer, "Gegenwart des Geistes und eschatologisches Hoffnung," p. 503, n. 3.

<sup>2</sup>"To the question: 'What happened at Pentecost?' we may answer, a fresh revelation of God's activity in the present, which resulted not only in a new experience of God through Christ in the lives of all believers, but a new quality of fellowship." Flew, p. 151.

<sup>3</sup>James Denney, Jesus and the Gospel (New York: Hodder and



fully the understanding of the later koinonia.

### The Character of the Eschatological Community

According to Oscar Cullmann the word κύριος as used by Paul in reference to the living presence of the Lord includes rather than excludes the apostolic tradition (παραδόσις) concerning the historic Jesus:

The formula of I Corinthians 11:23 refers to the Christ who is present, in that he stands behind the transmission of the tradition, that is he works in it. . . . it is the united testimony of all the apostles which constitutes the Christian paradosis, in which the Kyrios himself is at work.<sup>1</sup>

This Pauline conception of the connection between κύριος and παραδόσις, Cullmann goes on to maintain, contains an "idea which, while not everywhere fully thought out in the same way, can yet be regarded as quite widespread in the early Church."<sup>2</sup> It has been shown in the preceding section of this chapter that the determinative factor in the New Testament koinonia is the person of Jesus as Lord and Christ who comes to the Church in the Holy Spirit. Thus if Cullmann is correct, a further examination of that tradition as it is now available and which was definitive for the early Christian experience of the Lord is indeed relevant for the New Testament koinonia not only on the basis of historical continuity, but also because the former relation of the disciples to each other and to Jesus inherent in that tradition is now by the Holy

---

Stoughton, 1908), pp. 12, 329.

<sup>1</sup>Oscar Cullmann, "The Tradition," The Early Church, ed. A. J. B. Higgins, tr. A. J. B. Higgins and S. Godman (London: SCM Press, 1956), p. 68.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 71.

Spirit brought to bear on the present koinonia of the Church. In this matter Horton observes:

we must not expect too absolute a contrast between the kind of fellowship seen in the mutual relations of the first disciples, and in the Jerusalem church after Pentecost. The same Lord was with both groups; what he had taught in words he now inwardly inspired.<sup>1</sup>

The character of the life of the eschatological community which began to take shape in response to Jesus' life and ministry<sup>2</sup> will be sketched in terms of three decisive moments which may be discerned in the action of Jesus in the moulding of that community. These moments in which the antecedents of the New Testament koinonia in the lives of Jesus' first disciples can be conveniently highlighted are (1) the calling of disciples to be with him, (2) the commissioning of the disciples to proclaim the Kingdom in word and deed and (3) the institution of the new covenant with the disciples as representing the new people of God.<sup>3</sup>

The call.---Jesus' sovereign<sup>4</sup> call to discipleship was intensely personal. To Peter and Andrew he said δεῦτε ὀπίσω μου and εὐθὺς ἀφείρες τὰ δίκτυα ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ (Mk. 1:17-18; Mt. 4:19-20). To Levi the word was ἀκολούθει μοι with the response

<sup>1</sup>Walter Marshall Horton, "The Christian Community: Its Lord and Its Fellowship, The Biblical Basis for Christian Ethics," Interpretation IV (October 1950), p. 395.

<sup>2</sup>Harald Riesenfeld, The Gospel Tradition and its Beginnings, A Study in the Limits of 'Formgeschichte' (London: A. R. Mowbray & Co., 1957), p. 29: "Granted the Messianic consciousness, then the circle of disciples formed the kernel of the corresponding eschatological community."

<sup>3</sup>Flew, pp. 16-17.

<sup>4</sup>Schlatter, p. 118: "In freier, königlicher Macht ergeht der Ruf Jesus an sie und ihnen liegt nur das eine ob, ihm zu gehorchen."

2  
7  
that ἀρστας ἡκολούθησεν αὐτῷ (Mk. 2:14; Mt. 9:9; Lk. 5: 27-28). The commanding factor in every instance is Jesus himself.<sup>1</sup> Discipleship is no more and no less than full loyalty to him. The relationship of Jesus to those he was calling out was reciprocally and thoroughly personal. The person of Jesus gave to their discipleship both its form and content.<sup>2</sup> The quality of the disciples' relationship to each other was conditioned by their mutual relation to Jesus. Here lies the distinction from all other models, the binding factor is neither the  $\overline{\tau\overline{\tau}}\overline{\tau}\overline{\tau}$  nor an ideal<sup>3</sup> but a Person. Thus the stress is on the Person of Jesus in respect to the character of the emerging eschatological community.

Jesus' call to men to follow after him was intrinsically grounded in the effective presence of the Kingdom in himself. Those who responded in some sense recognized this (Mk. 1:22;  $\omega\varsigma \epsilon\varsigma\theta\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha\nu$   $\epsilon\chi\omega\upsilon$ ) and were consequently separated by him from their natural and historical setting and introduced into an "eschatological existence" of communion with himself.<sup>4</sup> Although in a sense Kümmel is correct when he insists that "there can be no question of the presence of the Kingdom of God in the 'congregation' during his (Jesus') lifetime,"<sup>5</sup> there is no

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Mk. 8:34 (Mt. 16:24; Lk. 9:23; cf. Jn. 1:43; 12:26; 21:19); Mk. 10:21 (Mt. 19:21; Lk. 18:20); Mt. 8:22 (Lk. 9:59); Mt. 10:38 (Lk. 14:27); Lk. 14:33; Bornkamm, Jesus of Nazareth, pp. 146f.

7  
<sup>2</sup>Karl Heinrich Rengstorff, "μανθάνω, καταμανθάνω μαθήτης . . ." Theologische Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. Gerhard Kittel (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1942), IV, 448.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 450. Cf. pp. 434-443, for his discussion of the Rabbinic use of  $\overline{\tau\overline{\tau}}\overline{\tau}\overline{\tau}$ .

<sup>4</sup>To use the terminology of James Robinson, The Problem of History



doubt that those called of Jesus stood in a new relationship to the coming Kingdom in Jesus: "das ἀκολουθεῖν ist: Teilhaben an dem in Jesus sich anbietenden Heil."<sup>1</sup> This gives to the call the character of an act of grace<sup>2</sup> as is particularly evident in the call of Levi (Mk. 2:14-17) for Jesus' call was to repentance in view of the Kingdom (Mk. 1:15). In the fundamentally eschatological character of discipleship as dependent upon the significance of Jesus is seen the essence of the transcendence of that discipleship from that of the Rabbis. Jesus transcends the  $\text{לך לך}$  (Mk. 1:22; Mt. 7:29).<sup>3</sup> In him is present the salvation of God in an immediate manner to which the  $\text{לך לך}$  of the Rabbis cannot be compared (Mt. 5:17).<sup>4</sup> There is therefore no real inner connection between the two, just a similarity of outward pattern. Here too is the contrast with the koinonia of the Qumran community, for while the latter is based upon an eschatological expectation, it was one merely of hope rather than of realization. The same can be said for those who gathered themselves around the eschatological preaching of John the Baptist (Mk. 1:5; 2:18; Mt. 11:2; Jn. 1:35; 3:25; 4:1),<sup>5</sup>

---

in Mark, p. 79.

<sup>5</sup>Kümmel, pp. 139-140; cf. pp. 54, 126.

<sup>1</sup>Gerhard Kittel, "ἀκολουθεῖν . . ." Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. G. Kittel (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1932-1933), I, 214.

<sup>2</sup>Eduard Schweizer, Lordship and Discipleship (London: SCM Press, 1960), p. 13.

<sup>3</sup>Karl Heinrich Rengstorff, "Ἰδούτω . . ." Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. G. Kittel (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1935), II, 159f.

<sup>4</sup>Rengstorff, "μαρθαίρω . . ." pp. 447, 450, 459.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 460.

only they stood in more direct anticipation of the ~~the~~ coming of the Kingdom in the person of Jesus. The expected but not inevitable shift was for the disciples of John to become the disciples of Jesus (Mk. 1:2-11; Jn. 1:24-37).<sup>1</sup> The call then constituted those who followed Jesus a Heilsgemeinde--a group who shared together an "eschatological existence" in intimate personal relationship to him who was to be revealed as both Lord and Christ.

From among his disciples Jesus chose twelve to a close companionship of life (ἵνα ᾧσιν μετ' αὐτοῦ ) in order that he might prepare them for their apostolic<sup>2</sup> task (Mk. 3:13-19). There were two groups to be distinguished among the disciples of Jesus, a wider circle of those who had responded to his message and a narrower circle composed of a few who accompanied him continually (cf. Mt. 12:15; Lk. 6:17).<sup>3</sup> The twelve were those chosen particularly to share fully in his earthly life and ministry. In the choice of the number twelve (cf. Mk. 4:10; 6:7; Mt. 10:1-2; 11:1; Lk. 6:13)<sup>4</sup> is the parabolic indication of the significance of this unique Lebensgemeinschaft.<sup>5</sup> As representative of the twelve tribes of Israel (Mt. 19:28; Lk. 22:30) in their parti-

<sup>1</sup>Some of John's disciples continued as such even after his decease. Cf. Acts 18:24-25; 19:3. A further indication of this may be the particular care taken in John's Gospel to set John the Baptist in subordination to Jesus (1:6-8, 15, 24-34; 3:25-30).

<sup>2</sup>See below pp. 200f.

<sup>3</sup>Rengstorff, "μαρθαίρω . . ." p. 448.

<sup>4</sup>Although the twelve were apostles, the apostles cannot be limited to the twelve. Vincent Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark, pp. 230, 619ff.

<sup>5</sup>Karl Heinrich Rengstorff, "Σύδεκα," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. G. Kittel (Stuttgart: W. Kohl-

cipation in Jesus' mission they are to form the kernel of the new people of God--a new Israel.<sup>1</sup> They are the nucleus (τὸ μικρὸν ποίμνιον) of those to whom it is given "to receive a share in God's Kingship, to be one of those appointed to reign"<sup>2</sup> (Lk. 12:32). It was to fit them to fulfil an essential role in the implementation of the Salvation of God in his own life and ministry that Jesus selected the twelve for such an intimate and complete sharing of life with him.<sup>3</sup> It is the unique quality of this life-together which contains in an already bursting bulb the koinonia "quality of life" to which the New Testament gives explicit witness after Pentecost.

The character of this developing eschatological community was manifested in the common life (Lk. 8:1-3; cf. Dt. 15:4) with Jesus to which the twelve were called and chosen. It was in constant fellowship with him that the Kingdom quality of life was impressed upon them. This was effected by their constant attendance upon the actions and words of Jesus which bore a common witness to the significance of his person and mission. Jesus often withdrew from the crowd to be with his disciples and to instruct them (Mk. 4:10, 34; 6:31; 7:17; 9:28). For them the form of Jesus' words was filled with the content of his own person in his actions toward them and toward those to whom his mission

---

hammer, 1935), II, 327.

<sup>1</sup>Joachim Jeremias, Jesus' Promise to the Nations, tr. S. H. Hooke (London: SCM Press, 1958), p. 21.

<sup>2</sup>Richardson, p. 86. Cf. Kümmel, p. 54.

<sup>3</sup>T. W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus, pp. 237-240, posits behind μαθητῆς the Aramaic ܡܬܪܬܡ (apprentice) rather than the Rabbinic תלמיד Cf. Rengstorff, "μαρθαίω . . ." pp. 434ff.

8/



was directed.<sup>1</sup> He lived what he taught. It is in the united impact of the work and words of Jesus upon the twelve<sup>2</sup> in the daily experience of their life together that the essential nature of their incipient koinonia can be ascertained. This can perhaps be conveniently approached from three angles keeping in mind that here is a training period awaiting the dynamic of the Holy Spirit for its effective implementation.

First, the unique character of their relationship to Jesus can be seen in their common life. This of course cannot be adequately accounted for apart from the significance of the life and ministry of Jesus, for the relationship of the disciples to him was certainly affected by their view of him. Their knowledge of that significance could only rise from a sharing of the way with him as "only the disciple can know who Jesus really is."<sup>3</sup> This is indicated by the confession of Mark 8:27ff. which still remained far from fully adequate in understanding as the Gospel record indicates.<sup>4</sup> Here is the relevance of the messianic secret: "to those who are without, everything is obscure"<sup>5</sup> (Mk. 4:11). It is not, however, to be denied that the disciples were aware of a certain uniqueness of Jesus in respect to the things of God when Jesus so

---

<sup>1</sup>Here the method of Bornkamm is pertinent: "it is the special character of his message and work, that Jesus is to be found in his word and in his actions." Jesus of Nazareth, p. 170. Cf. T. W. Manson, The Servant-Messiah, p. 67.

<sup>2</sup>While the twelve were not the only disciples who followed in the company of Jesus from time to time, they were those who most consistently and in a unique sense continued with Jesus: "You are those who have continued with me in my trials." (Lk. 22:28).

<sup>3</sup>E. Schweizer, Lordship and Discipleship, p. 21.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Rengstorff, "μαθηται . . .," p. 454.

<sup>5</sup>Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus, p. 15.

forthrightly called them as is obviously inherent in their immediate response,<sup>1</sup> but rather that a comprehension of that uniqueness could only be gained through obedient fellowship. And this they began to realize as they attended on his ministry in the light of his own words: "But if it is by the finger of God that I cast out demons, then the kingdom of God has come upon you" (Lk. 11:20; cf. Lk. 7:19-23). As companions to Jesus' exorcisms, healing miracles, nature miracles, his assumption of the authority to forgive sins, his transcendent approach to the law, his concern for the poor and downtrodden, not to mention his continuous proclamation of the Kingdom, they were more and more able to discern the sovereign saving activity of God in Jesus and to recognize him as one in whom the will of God came realistically and meaningfully to them:

ἡ ἀρχὴ τοῦ ἐμμοῦ <sup>2</sup> (Mt. 11:25-30; Cf. Lk. 10:21-24).

In view of the eschatological crisis inherent in the breaking in of the Kingdom in him the claims of Jesus upon the twelve were radical:<sup>3</sup> "Lo, we have left everything and followed you" (Mk. 10:28; cf. 10:21; Lk. 14:33) was Peter's personal characterization of discipleship. Their loyalty to the Kingdom as resident in Jesus meant the most complete and stringent devotion superseding every care of the present age--occupation

<sup>1</sup>It is very probable that this was not their first contact with Jesus. Cf. Jn. 1:35ff. Rengstorff, "ἡ ἀρχὴ τοῦ ἐμμοῦ", . . . , p. 449, comments that in the call Jesus "Wort entfaltet die eigentlich bindenden Kräfte erst da, wo der Anschluss an ihn bereits vollzogen ist."

<sup>2</sup>Schlatter, p. 388: Jesus is "der Bringer der Herrschaft Gottes, mit der seine gebende Gnade zum Menschen kommt." Cf. Rengstorff, "ἡ ἀρχὴ τοῦ ἐμμοῦ", . . . , p. 411.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Amos N. Wilder, Eschatology and Ethics in the Teaching of Jesus (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1939-1950), pp. 164ff. He concludes that "Jesus so identifies himself with the cause of the Kingdom that its demands merge with loyalty to his

(Mk. 1:18; 2:24), riches (Mt. 6:19-33), family (Mt. 10:37) and even self (Lk. 14:26). Jesus taught them that the Kingdom was of such supreme worth that a man can with joy forego all else for its possession (Mt. 13:44-46),<sup>1</sup> and that loyalty to it must penetrate to the very heart of a man, to an undivided will (Mt. 5:20; 6:22-24; 23:23-28; Mk. 12:28-30). The disciple's prayer was to be "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done" (Mt. 6:10). It was that will of God which constituted the very essence of the life of the one they were following after. The radical separation which was at the heart of their discipleship was even more a part of Jesus' life (Mt. 8:19-22). In response to the concern of his own family Jesus looked out upon his disciples and said, "Here are my mother and my brothers! Whoever does the will of God is my brother, and sister, and mother" (Mk. 3:34-35; cf. Jn. 4:34; 17:19). To share his life was to share in his unconditional obedience to the will of God, for that will was embodied in his person and mission:<sup>2</sup> "The disciple is, naturally, to be as his Master"<sup>3</sup> (Mt. 10:25). The Reign and will of God was made intimate and personal to the disciples in Jesus, thus placing their relationship to it in an intensely personal context.<sup>4</sup>

Second, manifest in their common life with Jesus was the ex-

---

person." p. 175.

<sup>1</sup>Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus, p. 140.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Cullmann's discussion on "Jesus and the Son of God Designation," The Christology of the New Testament, pp. 275-290.

<sup>3</sup>Wilder, p. 166.

<sup>4</sup>This is evident especially in the intimacy of the common meal which Jesus so effectively utilized. See below pp. 197ff. Cf. Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, pp. 136f.



pected quality of the disciples' relationship to each other.<sup>1</sup> For this relationship Jesus himself was determinative as J. S. Stewart so aptly comments:

Isaiah's vision of the world and the lamb dwelling together was surely near fulfilment when Simon the Zealot, the fiery nationalist, went arm-in-arm with Matthew the tax-gatherer and publican! Only one thing could explain that strange union: they had each found Jesus.<sup>2</sup>

The ethic which he imparted to them by precept Jesus manifested in his own life. Interpreted through his life the Golden Rule became "do unto others as he (Jesus) has done unto you"<sup>3</sup> creating "an utterly new type of human society, as different from the best previous Gentile models as from the best previous Jewish models:"<sup>4</sup>

You know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great men exercise authority over them. It shall not be so among you; but whoever would be great among you must be your servant, and whoever would be first among you must be your slave; even as the Son of man came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many (Mt. 20:25-28).

Among them was to be no place-seeking or rank distinction (Mk. 12:38f.; Lk. 4:43; cf. IQS 7:19-23). The quality of their lives was to be characterized by the love whose pattern is to be found in the Lord who has become a servant (Lk. 22:27; Mk. 10:45; Jn. 13:15f.).<sup>5</sup> The relationship of the disciples to each other was to be a Sermon-on-the-Mount<sup>6</sup> quality

<sup>1</sup>In this phase of the discussion the implications of the "commission" are anticipated. See below pp. 201ff.

<sup>2</sup>James S. Stewart, The Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ (Edinburgh: The Church of Scotland Committee on the Religious Instruction of Youth, 1957), p. 58.

<sup>3</sup>Horton, p. 392.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.

<sup>5</sup>Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus, p. 140.

<sup>6</sup>The relationship between disciples does not of course exhaust

of life--the will of God as it came to them in Jesus.<sup>1</sup> The heart of that will Jesus laid bare in the Great Commandment:

Hear, O Israel; The Lord our God, the Lord is one; and you shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind, and with all your strength. . . . You shall love your neighbor as yourself (Mk. 12:29-31).

Of this quintessence of Jewish ethics Jesus was himself the supreme fulfilment.<sup>2</sup> The imperative of the inner-disciple relationship in substance is then that contained in the Johannine saying: "love one another, even as I have loved you" (Jn. 13:34; cf. 17:26).

Third, indicated in their life together with Jesus was the relationship of the disciples to those outside the eschatological family. The ethic is again that directly present in Jesus:

The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has anointed me to preach good news to the poor, He has sent me to proclaim release to the captives and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty those who are oppressed, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord. . . . Today has this scripture been fulfilled in your hearing (Lk. 4:16-21; cf. Is. 61:1f.).

The first beatitude--"Blessed are you poor, for yours is the kingdom of God" (Lk. 6:20; Mt. 5:3)<sup>3</sup> --epitomizes the compassion of Jesus' activity

---

the dimension of the Sermon on the Mount. Appropriate but not possible here would be a detailed presentation of the ethic of Jesus. Cf. T. W. Manson, Ethics and the Gospel (London: SCM Press, 1960), pp. 43-68.

<sup>1</sup>"We cannot then distinguish between the general ethical principles of Jesus, as represented for instance in the Sermon on the Mount, and the drastic summons to personal discipleship." Wilder, p. 167.

<sup>2</sup>T. W. Manson, Ethics and the Gospel, pp. 61f.

<sup>3</sup>Karl Heinrich Rengstorff, Das Evangelium nach Lukas, Das Neue Testament Deutsch (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1952), p. 89, sees in this verse "die Armen in dem doppelten Sinn der äusseren Armut und des Armseins vor Gott." Cf. William Manson, The Gospel of Luke, the Moffatt New Testament Commentary, ed. James Moffatt (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1930), pp. 64f.

(Lk. 7:18-23) in respect to the poor and despised (Lk. 14:12-14), the helpless (Mk. 9:37) and the insignificant (Mt. 18:10). Here was a boundless love (Mt. 5:43-48; Lk. 10:25-37)<sup>1</sup> that burst through all the barriers imposed by the "righteous" in Israel:<sup>2</sup> "But woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! because you shut the kingdom of heaven against men; for you neither enter yourselves, nor allow those who would enter to go in" (Mt. 23:13). Jesus shockingly demonstrated this dimension by his custom of sitting at table with his disciples in the company of tax collectors and sinners (Mt. 9:10-13; Mk. 2:15-17; Lk. 5:29-32; 19:1-10) which occasioned the caustic characterization of the Scribes and Pharisees: "Behold a glutton and a drunkard, a friend of tax collectors and sinners!" (Mt. 11:19).<sup>3</sup> For the Jew to eat with others was the closest form of intimacy implying personal favour;<sup>4</sup> thus by eating with such religious outcasts Jesus gave striking content to his words: "I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance" (Lk. 5:32). The significance of this can be further realized in the light of the messianic banquet in the Old Testament (Is. 25:6-8) and Judaism<sup>5</sup> in

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Jeremias' discussion of the Good Samaritan, The Parables of Jesus, pp. 140-142, and the more general discussion in Gottfried Quell and Ethelbert Stauffer, Love, Bible Key Words, tr. J. R. Coates (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1949), pp. 45-53.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Moore, II, 156ff.

<sup>3</sup>Lk. 15:2: "And the Pharisees and scribes murmured, saying, 'This man receives sinners and eats with them'" is reported by Luke as the occasion for the parables of the Lost Sheep, Coin and Son.

<sup>4</sup>Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, pp. 146f. Cf. Strack-Billerbeck, IV, 611f. The implications of table fellowship continued to pose difficulties in the early church as is evident from Acts 6, Galatians 2 and I Corinthians 8-11.

<sup>5</sup>Strack-Billerbeck, IV, 1154f.



which fellowship with God and the joys of the messianic age were symbolized by table fellowship. Jesus spoke of the banquet as reaching out to envelop also the Gentiles (Mt. 8:11; Lk. 13:29).<sup>1</sup> His parables make it clear that he saw a definite connection between the coming messianic banquet and his own table fellowship (Lk. 14:15-24; Mt. 22:1-10; Cf. Mk. 14:25; Lk. 22:16, 30),<sup>2</sup> and he may even possibly have had the eschatological banquet in mind at the feeding of the five thousand (Mk. 6:34-44; Mt. 14:14-21; Lk. 9:11-17).<sup>3</sup> The substance of the matter is that the circle of Jesus and his disciples exhibits a koinonia that does not limit by excuse of law, tradition or fear of self-contamination its love to those less privileged than themselves. Here was not an exclusively separatist and pure messianic community as the Pharisees and Essenes were so intent on setting up,<sup>4</sup> but rather the law transcended and fulfilled by "love your neighbor as yourself" (Mk. 12:31) defined in intimate contact with him who "came to seek and to save the lost" (Lk. 19:10). In the definition of neighbor as simply the one in need (Lk. 10:25-37) those who were once negatively koinoi become koinoi in the more positive sense of the term. That limitless love which the disciples had

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Jeremias, Jesus' Promise to the Nations, pp. 59-70.

<sup>2</sup>Bornkam, Jesus of Nazareth, p. 81.

<sup>3</sup>Vincent Taylor, The Life and Ministry of Jesus (London: Macmillan and Co., 1954), pp. 121f. Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, pp. 136f, thinks that from the confession of Peter at Caesarea onwards, every meal of the disciples with Jesus was "an actual anticipation of the eschatological meal."

<sup>4</sup>The two parables of the Tares among the Wheat (Mt. 13:24-30) and of the Seine-net (13:47f.) were probably spoken in reply to those who were indignant at Jesus' opposite course of action. Cf. Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus, pp. 154f.

each experienced as a gift of grace<sup>1</sup> was to characterize their relation to those who were yet lost: "You, therefore, must be perfect, as your heavenly father is perfect" (Mt. 5:48). This aspect leads to the second moment in Jesus' activity in the moulding of the character of the group who were associated with him.

The commission.--The disciples were not only recipients of the powers of the coming Kingdom present in Jesus' words and deeds, but they were also distinctly commissioned by him to share in the task of the proclamation of the Kingdom (Mt. 9:35-10:42; Mk. 6:7-13; Lk. 9:1-6, 10; cf. Lk. 10:1-20). The latter was the correlate of the former: *ὑποτάξτε, ὑποτασσάμενοι* (Mt. 10:8). In fact their participation in the mission of Jesus was already implicit in both the call to discipleship and the selection of the twelve. The call included the promise: "I will make you become fishers of men" (Mk. 1:17; cf. Mt. 4:19);<sup>2</sup> and the choice of the twelve anticipated the commission: "And he appointed twelve, to be with him, and to be sent out to preach and have authority to cast out demons" (Mk. 3:14-15).<sup>3</sup> The granting to the disciples *ἐξουσίαν* (Mk. 6:7; Mt. 10:1; Lk. 9:1)<sup>4</sup> over the unclean spirits as well as the power to heal (Mt. 10:1; Lk. 9:1) as they were commission-

<sup>1</sup>"If you love those who love you, what *χρῆς* is that to you?" (Lk. 6:32).

<sup>2</sup>Luke records that Jesus said to Simon: "henceforth you will be catching men" (5:10). The use of *koinonos* in the verse to indicate business partner could suggest that the call involves a new "business partnership"--the Kingdom business.

<sup>3</sup>Hunter, *The Work and Words of Jesus*, p. 61. Luke actually says *οὐς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὀνόμασε* (6:13) which is also a strongly attested variant at Mark 3:14.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Mk. 1:27; 2:10; 11:28ff.

ed to proclaim the Kingdom (Mk. 6:12; Mt. 10:7; Lk. 9:1) identifies their mission as an extension of the ministry of Jesus himself.<sup>1</sup> And in that mission the disciples were made sharers in the authoritative powers of the Kingdom resident in Jesus' own ministry. A further illustration of this is the charge to Peter: "I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven" (Mt. 16:18-19, 18:18).<sup>2</sup>

The character of their commission can then be described as apostolic<sup>3</sup> in that the origin of apostleship lies in this commissioning of the disciples and in view of the further possibility that Jesus used the title in its Aramaic form (sh<sup>e</sup>liḥa).<sup>4</sup> The import of the term comes from the Jewish shaliḥ institution<sup>5</sup> by which the one sent legally bears the authority of the one who sent him (cf. Jn. 13:16). Jesus cleansed and filled the concept with his own content intensifying the duty of the one authorized to an unquestioning obedience to the will of God in humble service. In like manner the sense of identity between Jesus and those commissioned in respect to the will and activity of God is heightened: "He who receives you receives me, and he who receives me receives him who sent me" (Mt. 10:40).<sup>6</sup> Leenhardt would say: "When His disciples

---

<sup>1</sup>T. W. Manson, The Servant-Messiah, p. 59.

<sup>2</sup>Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus, p. 150. Schlatter, pp. 511f.; Cf. Flew, pp. 134ff.

<sup>3</sup>This is not to be thought of as limited to the original twelve as the account of the Seventy (Lk. 10:1-20) indicates. Cf. K. H. Rengstorff, Apostleship, Bible Key Words, tr. J. R. Coates (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1952), pp. 36f. He stresses that the idea is that of "commission" rather than "office" and remained so in the early Church.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 38.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 40. Cf. pp. 11-24.

<sup>6</sup>The Lukan saying in the sending of the Seventy adds: "and he



proclaim the Gospel in His name, they actualize His presence."<sup>1</sup> That the apostolic commission expresses a unique identity between Jesus and his disciples in the task of the Kingdom is shown in Jesus' words to prepare the disciples for expected persecution in the execution of that task: "A disciple is not above his teacher, nor a servant above his master, it is enough for the disciple to be like his teacher, and the servant like his master" (Mt. 10:24-25).

The commission thus brings out the fact that discipleship leads to a full sharing in the life and ministry of Jesus; they participate in his destiny.<sup>2</sup> As Rengstorff expresses it: "Da Jesu Weg ihn zum Kreuz führt, so hat der Eintritt in seine Gemeinschaft als sein μαθητὴς die Verpflichtung zum Leiden zur Folge."<sup>3</sup> This further bearing of following Jesus becomes more explicit beginning with the confession of Peter<sup>4</sup> which was without doubt a turning point in the relation of Jesus to the disciples. With the confession, T. W. Manson comments, "the calling of the disciples begins all over again."<sup>5</sup> For no sooner had Peter voiced

---

who rejects you rejects me, and he who rejects me rejects him who sent me" (Lk. 10:16). Cf. Mk. 9:41, V. Taylor, Forgiveness and Reconciliation, p. 135; Flew, pp. 115f.

<sup>1</sup>F. J. Leenhardt, "This is My Body," in Oscar Cullmann, F. J. Leenhardt, Essays on the Lord's Supper, tr. J. G. Davies (London: Lutterworth Press, 1958), p. 34.

<sup>2</sup>Kittel, p. 214: "Diese ἀκολουθεῖν bedeutet aber gleichzeitig ein Teilhaben an dem Geschick Jesu."

<sup>3</sup>Rengstorff, "μαθητὴς . . .," p. 453.

<sup>4</sup>Mk. 8:27-30; Mt. 16:13-20; Lk. 9:18-21.

<sup>5</sup>T. W. Manson, p. 72. Maurice Goguel would put it: "He now asks for attachment to his person, and not only for the acceptance of his message." The Life of Jesus, tr. Olive Wyon (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1933), p. 385.

the conviction that Jesus was the Christ (Mk. 8:29) than did Jesus begin to stress *ὅτι δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πολλὰ παθεῖν* (Mk. 8:31). Matthew (16:21) records that from this event on Jesus began to show to his disciples the divine necessity of the way of the cross.<sup>1</sup> From this time on "three themes are closely linked in Mark's narrative: the relentless claims of Jesus on his disciples, the stubborn hopes and ambitions of the disciples themselves, and the repeated predictions of the Passion of the Son of Man."<sup>2</sup> Jesus purports now to set forth the consummation of his messianic ministry and what it requires of those who follow him.<sup>3</sup> As Schlatter puts it: "War er für sie der Christus, so war damit eine Gemeinschaft begründet, die durch nichts zerrissen werden konnte. Damit hatten sie sich ihm zum Leben und Sterben ergeben."<sup>4</sup> In the Gospel accounts there follow on the first prediction of the passion sayings of Jesus which elucidate the implications of following one whose destiny was to be the cross:

If any man would come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me. For whoever would save his life will lose it; and whoever loses his life for my sake and the gospel's will save it. For what does it profit a man, to gain the whole world and forfeit his life? For what can a man give in return for his life? For whosoever is ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him will the Son of man also be ashamed, when he comes in the glory of his Father with the holy angels (Mk. 8:34-38).<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Indicative is Jesus' reply to Peter's rebuke: "Get behind me, Satan! For you are not on the side of God, but of men" (Mk. 8:33). Cf. Schlatter, pp. 518f.

<sup>2</sup>T. W. Manson, The Servant-Messiah, p. 72.

<sup>3</sup>N. B. Stonehouse, The Witness of Matthew and Mark to Christ (London: The Tyndale Press, 1944), p. 67.

<sup>4</sup>Schlatter, p. 515.

<sup>5</sup>The occurrence of these sayings at this point is ascribed by

Here too is the hint of exaltation for the disciples corresponding to the prediction of the resurrection (Mk. 8:31): "As Jesus' own way, by divine necessity, leads to rejection, suffering and death, and only so to glory, so also the way of those who follow him."<sup>1</sup> Indicated is no mere imitation but more certainly "die Lebens- und Leidensgemeinschaft mit dem Messias, die erst an der Gemeinschaft seines Heils entsteht."<sup>2</sup> Jesus' way was with as well as for men.<sup>3</sup> Those who followed Jesus were to share in the manner of his Servant mission. They were participants in the Son of man destiny. Mark's description of the setting of the third passion prediction intimates that they were becoming conscious of that fact: "And they were on the road, going up to Jerusalem, and Jesus was walking ahead of them; and they were amazed, and those who followed were afraid" (Mk. 10:32).<sup>4</sup> The incident which follows on the third passion prediction (Mk. 10:35-45), the ambitious request of James and John for privileged positions, denotes the difficulty the disciples experienced in truly grasping the force of Jesus' instruction which he again expressed in his answer to them: "The cup that I drink you will drink; and with the baptism with which I am baptized, you will be bap-

---

Taylor to Mark's "good editorial insight, for it is to such a period that they naturally belong." The Gospel According to St. Mark, p. 380. Cf. Floyd B. Filson, The Gospel According to St. Matthew (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1960), p. 189.

<sup>1</sup>E. Schweizer, Lordship and Discipleship, p. 20. Cf. his chapters on "Jesus as the Suffering and Exalted Righteous One," pp. 32-41, and "Jesus as the Suffering and Exalted Servant of God," pp. 49-55.

<sup>2</sup>Kittel, p. 214.

<sup>3</sup>T. W. Manson, The Servant-Messiah, p. 54.

<sup>4</sup>Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark, p. 437. Cf. Hunter, The Work and Words of Jesus, p. 112.



tized; . . ." (Mk. 10:39). It is in this context as was pointed out above that the basic character of the disciples' relationship to one another is to be found. For Jesus goes on to elucidate the prime motive as that of his own Servant mission (Mk. 10:42-45).<sup>1</sup> Granting, however, the disciples' lack of a full comprehension and manifestation of it, yet implicit in this incipient koinonia resident in their companionship with Jesus in his earthly ministry was a realistic sharing in his full destiny. This fact is also the theme of the third moment in Jesus' dealing with his disciples.

The Covenant.--It was at the Last Supper that Jesus gave unique expression to the participation of the disciples in his life and ministry as he instituted with them the renewal of the Covenant (Ex. 24:8; Jer. 31:31ff.) which he was about to perfect in the sacrifice of himself. In the call the primary emphasis was that the disciples in their following of Jesus were brought into a salvation relationship to the Kingdom of God effectively present in Jesus' ministry. The commission stressed the fact that to follow Jesus implied also realistically taking part in his Kingdom task which was above all that of a suffering Servant. It was to lead ultimately to a cross; thus full discipleship was an indispensable prerequisite to sharing as a servant in the work of Jesus. The significance implicit in both the call and the commission are brought by Jesus into fine focus as he partook of his last meal in fellowship with the disciples in the imminence of his death.

The usual intimacy and implications of the common meal contained ultimate significance in that the Last Supper was set by Jesus unequiv-

---

<sup>1</sup>See above pp. 195ff.

ocally in the context of the historic Covenant-faith and future Covenant-hope of Israel. An integral part of the initiation of the Covenant relationship by God with Israel at Sinai (Ex. 24:5-11) was both a sacrifice and a common meal. The Covenant relationship down through the course of Israel's history had been renewed and exhibited by the festival of the Passover. This, the greatest of Jewish festivals, represented the whole of the Israelite cult; and more than any other, it manifested their solidarity as the people of God.<sup>1</sup> As Jesus and his disciples before the arrest partook of their last meal together the time of the Passover was at hand. And even apart from the question of whether or not the meal can be established as a legitimate Passover meal,<sup>2</sup> Jesus most certainly viewed it in the passover context.<sup>3</sup> By word and action at the meal Jesus interprets the significance of his entire life and ministry in terms of the Covenant to which the passover gave explicit

---

<sup>1</sup>See above pp. 128f.

<sup>2</sup>Among those who hold the Last Supper to have been a proper Passover are Gustaf Dalman, Jesus--Jeshua, pp. 86-184; Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus; Higgins, The Lord's Supper in the New Testament; Ethelbert Stauffer, Jesus and His Story, tran. Richard and Clara Winston (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1960), pp. 113-116, believes the Last Supper to have been a Passover meal, but one which was celebrated twenty-four hours before that celebrated officially by the Temple cult. He accounts for the propriety of this by the variations in calendar which have been proved to have existed in Palestine in Jesus' day. Cf. F. M. Cross, p. 36.

<sup>3</sup>Lk. 22:15: "I have earnestly desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer." There is an indisposition even among those who cannot make the exact identification to separate the meal from Passover connotations. Preiss, p. 83, asserts that there was "certainly an anticipation not of the Paschal meal itself but of the Paschal motifs . . ." Cf. Fuller, p. 71. Clark, p. 48, who is convinced that the evidence points only to an ordinary Jewish meal concedes that "passover ideas must inevitably have been in the mind both of Jesus and of his disciples."

expression:<sup>1</sup> "This is my blood of the covenant which is poured out for many" (Mk. 14:24; cf. 1 Cor. 11:25). It is probable that Jesus in some measure compared himself with the Passover Lamb,<sup>2</sup> although his basic conception of sacrifice was certainly more centrally that of the suffering Servant.<sup>3</sup> F. J. Leenhardt conceives of the comparison between Jesus and the Passover Lamb in a transcendent manner:

Jesus does not associate himself with the Paschal lamb, but with His body; the former victim which the rite recalled and represented is replaced by a new victim who at that very hour was engaged in the last episode of the drama that was soon to end in the cross.<sup>4</sup>

The most important relation of the Last Supper to the Passover is probably that of an anticipated fulfilment,<sup>5</sup> for Jesus conceived of his mission which was climaxed in the self-offering of himself as indispensable to the fulfilment of the historic Covenant-hope of God with his people. And it was to a complete fulfilment that Jesus looked forward (Mk. 14:25; Mt. 26:29; Lk. 22:15, 18) as he inaugurated his disciples as

---

<sup>1</sup>Stauffer, pp. 117f.

<sup>2</sup>Higgins, The Lord's Supper in the New Testament, pp. 49-54. He comments that the "real significance of the Passover lambs was that they represented the efficacious death of the lambs in Egypt." Cf. Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, pp. 142ff.

<sup>3</sup>Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, p. 152. Cf. Taylor, Jesus and His Sacrifice, p. 296. He finds the idea of sacrifice central in Jesus' interpretation of his death: "every important aspect of the sacrificial principle can be found in the thoughts of Jesus concerning His Passion. The aim of sacrifice is a restored fellowship; its medium is a representative offering; its spiritual condition is the attitude of the worshipper; its rationale is the offering of life; its culmination is sharing in the life offered by means of the sacred meal." P. 295. Is. 42:6-7; 49:8-9; connect the Servant with the idea of covenant.

<sup>4</sup>Leenhardt, p. 41.

<sup>5</sup>Fuller, p. 71; Higgins, The Lord's Supper in the New Testament,



the representative nucleus of the new people of God into a renewed Covenant. Intensely and realistically symbolized in the act and sayings of Jesus at the Last Supper by which he interpreted his impending death is the cardinal link in the continuity between the koinonia of the Old Testament and that of the New Testament.

Within the close-knit unity of the Last Supper<sup>1</sup> Jesus parabolically unfolded to the disciples their part in himself and his mission: "This is my body. . . . This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many." (Mk. 14:22,24). The idea of covenant is that of a saving relationship, a restored communion with God. Jesus saw in his coming death "the vicarious death of the Servant, which atones for the sins of the  $\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ , the whole world, and ushers in the beginnings of final salvation."<sup>2</sup> When he extended the bread and the wine to his disciples, he was inviting them to share in the life which he was offering for them; that is, in the redeeming power of his death.<sup>3</sup> Although Jesus' vocation of messianic suffering was unique, it was not something accomplished apart from and independent of men. According to Taylor Jesus' "redemptive service is not intended to be a work wrought apart from men; it is rather a work into which they are permitted to enter, in such a way that what he does on their behalf becomes a vital factor in their

---

p. 54.

<sup>1</sup>If the Last Supper was an actual Passover meal, the members would then constitute a distinct Passa-Habhūrā passover family. See above p. 150 cf. Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, pp. 139, 153.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 152.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 159. Taylor, Jesus and His Sacrifice, p. 266. Otto, p. 291.

approach to God."<sup>1</sup> The disciples are to participate in the power of his self-offering, enter into it and make it part of their own experience. But this they could not now effectively do.

The disciples' participation in the redemptive sufferings of Jesus was also for others. They were to share fully in the messianic ministry. This is evident in the eschatological perspective of the Last Supper--a proleptic partaking of the messianic banquet which symbolized the consummation of the Kingdom (Mk. 14:25; Mt. 26:29). The Kingdom which Jesus was to begin to consummate through the events of his passion, he grants to the disciples in their eating of the bread and the drinking of the wine which take their context from the covenanting self-offering of Jesus. Luke reports that after the Supper Jesus tells the twelve:

You are those who have continued with me in my trials; as my Father appointed (διδέθετο) a kingdom for me so do I appoint (διατίθεμαι) for you that you may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel. (Lk. 22:28-30)

To those who have been placed by their discipleship in a distinct relation (διαμεμενηκότες) to his passion, Jesus "covenants"<sup>2</sup> an authoritative part in the coming Kingdom. Their commission by which they were made "partners" in Jesus' messianic mission is now firmly grounded in that act of Jesus by which the Father once for all grants to Jesus that which he will henceforth from the events of his death and resurrection continue to impart<sup>3</sup> to the eschatological community represented in the twelve.

---

<sup>1</sup>Taylor, Jesus and His Sacrifice, p. 265.

<sup>2</sup>Flew, p. 40. Rengstorf, Das Evangelium nach Lukas, p. 24b.

<sup>3</sup>The change in tense from aorist to present is significant.

Thus both the call and the commission, the disciples' share in the messianic destiny, is fully and significantly expressed at the Last Supper which anticipates the perfection of communion between the redeemed community and its Redeemer. To this the disciples' actual behaviour in the face of the gloom of coming events provides a provoking contrast. Luke gives an account of a dispute over the place which may have arisen out of the Supper itself (Lk. 22:24-27).<sup>1</sup> The presence of the foot-washing episode in the similar context in John's Gospel (13:2-17) witnesses to the existence of such contrasting attitudes at the Last Supper. The disciples failed to grasp the heart of Jesus' action for the quality of their relationship one to another. Their sharing at this point contained a scandalous degree of superficiality. After the Supper, perhaps yet within the Passa-Ḥabhūrā unity,<sup>2</sup> his intimates, Peter, James and John, failed to enter realistically into the Gethsemane agony of Jesus in response to his plea to "remain here, and watch" (Mk. 14:34).<sup>3</sup> And Peter's tragic denial (Mk. 14:66-72) only highlights the disciples' common desertion of Jesus in his hour of redemptive destiny: "And they all forsook him and fled" (Mk. 14:50). But Jesus realized and expected this: "You will all fall away; for it is written, 'I will strike the shepherd and the sheep will be scattered.'" (Mk. 14:27). It was as he spoke to Peter in the Garden; "Watch and pray that you may not enter into temptation; the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak" (Mk.

---

<sup>1</sup>Dalman, Jesus-Jeshua, p. 18. This account comes from Luke's special source and need not merely be an editorial placing of the material in Mk. 10:42-45 (Mt. 20:24-28). T. W. Manson, The Gospel of Luke, p. 244: Rengstorff, Das Evangelium nach Lukas, pp. 245f.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. D. Daube, pp. 332-335.

<sup>3</sup>V. Taylor, Jesus and His Sacrifice, pp. 150-155.



14:38). Their loyalty to Jesus fashioned down through the days of common life with him was so great that they did not forsake him until the very end. But then their repudiation was so complete that hope can remain, not because they can eventually bring themselves into alignment with the radical and ultimate claim of the cross, but only because of what is about to take place on their behalf in Jesus' death and resurrection.<sup>1</sup> Their failure was due not to an unwilling heart but to an overwhelming weakness of the flesh which only the coming of the Kingdom in power could cure.

The betrayal of Judas decisively demonstrates the new radical dimension of the eschatological community. Judas did far more than fall short of the demands of discipleship; he denied its essential basis. It is likely that the central factor in his betrayal was Jesus' conception of messiahship to which he could not reconcile himself,<sup>2</sup> and thus by his tragic action he denied the effective presence of the eschatological Kingdom in the person and ministry of Jesus. The similarity of Judas' act to Jesus' teaching concerning the sin against the Holy Spirit (Mk. 3:28-30; Mt. 12:31-32; Lk. 12:10)<sup>3</sup> is striking, for Jesus went on to say sadly of him: "For the Son of man goes as it is written of him, but woe to that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed! It would have been better for that man if he had not been born" (Mk. 14:21). As Judas went out so heinously disregarding the obligation of table fellowship,<sup>4</sup> a

---

<sup>1</sup>Stonehouse, p. 85.

<sup>2</sup>Hunter, The Work and Words of Jesus, p. 116.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Cranfield, The Gospel According to Saint Mark, pp. 135-143.

<sup>4</sup>Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, p. 153, cf. Ps. 41:10; Jn. 13:18.

unity all the more binding as a covenant-meal and all the more sacred as the occasion of the supreme illustration of the anticipated Kingdom koinonia in every dimension, he went out for ever devoid of a part in either the salvation or mission of the Kingdom. It should not be overlooked that there was an inner kinship between Judas' act and the doubts in the hearts of the rest of the disciples as they too asked "Is it I?" (Mk. 14:19). The nature of their sin was similar, though it stemmed perhaps more from the weakness of the flesh than from a negative attitude to Jesus in view of the servant character of his mission. All in their own degree shattered the koinonia as they betrayed, denied and failed Jesus before the stark reality of his cross. Its holy or exclusive character is thus that resident in Jesus himself.<sup>1</sup> The dividing line is that sanctification which consists first of all in a personal relationship of radical loyalty and single obedience to Jesus in the full eschatological and redemptive bearing of his life and ministry as climaxed in his passion and resurrection. The remorse of Peter (Mk. 14:72) and the suicide of Judas (Mt. 27:3-15) evidence the seriousness of the transgression of this new demarkation line which transcends all current concepts of holiness.<sup>2</sup> All secondary and artificial barriers are cast aside; only one remains, and that obstacle only divine grace can overcome.

With the resurrection came a new implementation of the relationship of the disciples with Jesus which had been so severely strained on the disciples' part in virtue of the fate which Jesus had met. The

---

<sup>1</sup>Otto, pp. 290-291.

<sup>2</sup>See above pp. 150-151, 164, 168.

despondent state of the disciples between Jesus' death and resurrection clearly illustrates Jesus' indispensability for the unique character of their fellowship. But now those who during that time followed only from "afar off" (Mk. 14:54) are brought again by the risen Christ into messianic unity. He appears in their midst (Mt. 28:17; Lk. 24:36; cf. Mk. 16:14) and again enters into table fellowship with them (Lk. 24:30, 42-43; cf. Acts 1:4;<sup>1</sup> 10:41) which signifies their forgiveness and restoration. The eschatological prediction attendant on the Last Supper is beginning to be realized (Mk. 14:25).<sup>2</sup> The character of the messianic community is now to be consistent with that of their resurrected Lord. Just as his life and ministry begins again in a new sense with the resurrection so does the participation of the disciples in it. He takes up the messianic task<sup>3</sup> in the power of his resurrection which cannot be separated from the gift of the Spirit. The disciples, who apart from his renewed and continued leadership would merely have gone again fishing, "do not inherit their task from Christ, they share it with him."<sup>4</sup> The task remains dependent upon the presence of Jesus, for they are not to be primarily tradition-bearers but witnesses to Jesus himself (Lk.

<sup>1</sup> σὺν ἁλὶ ἔσθιεν may be derived from ἄλς meaning literally "taking salt with" and then more generally "eating with." F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 68. For further evidence cf. Bo Reicke, Glauben und Leben der Urgemeinde, pp. 13f., who takes it in this sense.

<sup>2</sup> See above pp. 178-179; 178, n. 4; 184-185; 184, n. 1.

<sup>3</sup> T. W. Manson, The Servant-Messiah, p. 96: "The work taken up again by the Risen Lord is the work of the earthly Ministry, strengthened, intensified, enlarged, no doubt, but still in all essentials the same task, informed by the same spirit and directed to the same ends."

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., p. 98.



24:46-49; Acts 1:8, 22; 2:32; 4:33).<sup>1</sup> It is Jesus' presence in the Holy Spirit which continues to constitute the basic character of the eschatological community and therefore the koinonia "quality of life" involved in it.

In conclusion it only need be stated that the life and ministry of Jesus is the supreme antecedent of the New Testament koinonia. Without it there could not be such a quality of life. Indeed as that life and ministry continues in a new and more potent manner as a result of Jesus' covenant-renewing death and resurrection it is the definitive and formative factor in that koinonia reality. What he is determines what it is. And the fundamental lines of its pattern were drawn in his daily life-together with those men who had responded to his eschatological summons. The quality of their relationship to him, to each other and to those without is throughout conditioned by who Jesus is and what he does. Love is the key principle, grace is its channel and total personal loyalty to Jesus as the one in whom the Kingdom has come is the category that envelops all the dimensions of this renewed eschatological existence. Those who followed Jesus and became disciples by that very fact find themselves in a new relation to God, they possess a new basis for their relation one-to-another and they discover themselves in a new context of obligation to those beyond their circle. The idea of the holy is focused in the ethic of faith-obedience. Holiness becomes supremely a matter of the heart. This is the new wine which the old wineskins can no longer contain. This is the quality of life that Jesus continues to effect as Lord of the eschatological Spirit. This is the

---

<sup>1</sup>Rengstorff, "μαρθάρω, . . ." pp. 458-460.

koinonia whose apprehension and manifestation in the primitive church of the Acts of the Apostles, the letters of Paul<sup>1</sup> and the Johannine literature is to continue to be the object of inquiry.

---

<sup>1</sup>The Petrine literature and the Epistle to the Hebrews will be touched in connection with the letters of Paul.

### PART THREE: THE THEOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT

#### CHAPTER V

#### KOINONIA AS EXPERIENCED IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH

##### Introduction

The purpose of the present study has been to examine the use and significance of the koinonia language in the New Testament. Part One was devoted to an investigation into the primary meaning and function of the terminology in each New Testament context. This task was based upon criteria gained from an inquiry into the employment of koinonia and cognates apart from the New Testament literature. In this inquiry the basic dual-dimensional capability of the words and the governing nature of the vertical reference of the idea of "sharing in" was observed. The general conclusion resulting from this discipline which concerned itself primarily with the linguistic basis of the New Testament concept of koinonia was that the koinonia language as employed by the New Testament writers witnesses to a "sharing-together quality of life" occasioned by a common experience of Christ, expressed in some degree of common life and impregnated by the "idea of the holy." Each New Testament area comprehended this basic reality in its own unique way and used the koinonia terminology accordingly.

Since this "quality of life" now seen as the focal point of the study was hardly an isolated phenomenon, an effort was made in Part Two



to trace its religious background in order to provide an illuminating setting in terms of continuity and contrast. Pagan religion and thought furnished a general rather than specific similarity of concept and motif as well as of terminological usage. The particular roots of the New Testament reality, however, are to be found in the Old Testament where the ancient conceptions of solidarity were intensified in the covenant relationship of God with his people Israel. Here was a realistic sense of "psychic unity" conditioned by loyalty to the Divine Person which affected every aspect of life, and which when failed of by general disobedience gave rise in the breasts of the faithful to the hope of an ideal fulfilment. This fundamental covenant unity with its attendant hope, maintained in various degrees in the course of Israel's history, was preserved with differing legalistic and eschatological emphases in the Judaism of New Testament times as distinct segments of the people attempted in their own peculiar manner to be true to the historic covenant of God with his people. Although the covenant motif remained in general force, it found expression in movements which generated an intensified sense of koinonia within themselves but which had the effect of lessening the "psychic unity" of the people as a whole who were ideally bound by a common covenant to the God of Israel. True covenant unity and quality of life was a matter of eschatological and apocalyptic hope often conceived in a narrow sectarian manner. It is the valid elements of this covenant hope of the Kingdom that supply the link with the life and ministry of Jesus which in turn is the immediate occasion of the new koinonia "quality of life." In him was brought to focus and fulfilment the historic faith and hope of Israel. In the eschatological significance of Jesus' person and mission, in his radical summons to men

and in the redemptive action of God released in the culminating events of his death and resurrection God's past action is set upon a new plane on behalf of his people. The abiding result is a renewed and refined covenant unity with God through the Spirit of God in the lives of those who remained and became disciples in direct and characteristic continuity with the former "life-together" of the disciples with Jesus which included the period of the resurrection appearances. It is this New Covenant "quality of life" whose definitive content is Jesus as Lord and Christ to which the New Testament writers bear witness with their koinonia language.

Thus in this present and final section of the study the aim is to elucidate further the significance and theological understanding of this distinct and unique "quality of life" as it is portrayed and involved in koinonia and cognates in (1) the description of the Primitive Church in the Acts of the Apostles, (2) the letters of Paul and (3) the Johannine Literature. On the bases of the opening linguistic analysis and the further sketch of the religious background the method will be to examine the koinonia reality as it is revealed in each writer's employment of the koinonia terminology.

This third task begins with Luke's description of the Primitive Church in the opening chapters of the Acts of the Apostles. Luke actually only uses the term koinonia once in his account.<sup>1</sup> It occurs in a summary statement which both characterizes the life of the early church as it emerged from the Day of Pentecost and serves as a transi-

---

<sup>1</sup>See above pp. 82-90 for the detailed discussion of the precise use of koinonia by Luke here which furnishes the starting point of the inquiry of this chapter.

tion to his relating of the events which follow: ἦσαν δὲ πρὸς-  
καρτεροῦντες τῇ διδαχῇ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῇ κοινῇ,  
τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ ταῖς προσευχαῖς (2:42).

Although certainly influenced by his sources the language is most probably Luke's own at this point<sup>1</sup> as he attempts succinctly to present the distinctive features of the church's life. One he designates simply as τῇ κοινῇ. Luke's use of the term has been seen to comprehend a positive spiritual reality interior to the community--a "sharing-together" that gave effect to an inward bond which by its very nature sought for outward means of expression. The most characteristic expression as Luke reports it was the εἶχον ἅπαντα κοινά (2:44). In keeping with the dual-dimensional character of the koinonia language and reinforced by the context this "sharing-together" which resulted in such unanimity of spirit was judged to be "in the Holy Spirit." The emphasis is certainly on the horizontal reality, but Luke's use of the term includes its vertical and constitutive basis. It is the "quality of life" contained here and involved in Luke's presentation of the early life of the first church which is the object of this phase of the inquiry.

#### The Eschatological Setting

The Holy Spirit and the eschatological role of Jesus.--In the preceding chapter where the witness of the Synoptic Gospels was under consideration, the relation between the Spirit of God and Jesus was seen to have eschatological significance. It was their common role in respect

<sup>1</sup>See above pp. 86, 88 n. 5: and most recently Zimmermann, pp. 74-77.



to the breaking in of the eschatological Kingdom which furnished the link between Jesus as the bearer of the Spirit of God and the experience of the Holy Spirit in the Primitive Church. Thus it was preliminarily concluded that after Pentecost the Kingdom remains bound up with the person of Jesus as he now effects that Kingdom in the lives of his disciples through the instrumentality of the Holy Spirit which has been poured out upon them. It is this posited kingdom content of the Holy Spirit that needs to be briefly examined in terms of Luke's account of the early church in order that their koinonia reality might be considered in its proper eschatological setting.

Luke both by what he relates and the manner in which he relates it maintains and interprets<sup>1</sup> the subordinate relation of the Holy Spirit to the eschatological role of Jesus. He introduces the second division<sup>2</sup> of his work as essentially related<sup>3</sup> to what Jesus did and taught up to the Ascension (1:1).<sup>4</sup> He posits a heilsgeschichtliche Kontinuität<sup>5</sup> con-

<sup>1</sup>Hans Conzelmann, The Theology of Luke, tr. Geoffrey Buswell. (London: Faber and Faber, 1960), p. 136. Luke's understanding of the relationship between the Spirit and Jesus is in evidence throughout his Gospel. Cf. E. Schweizer, Spirit of God, pp. 36-39; and G. W. H. Lampe, "The Holy Spirit in the Writings of St. Luke," Studies in the Gospels, Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot, ed. D. E. Nineham (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), pp. 159-200.

<sup>2</sup>F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 65.

<sup>3</sup>W. C. Van Unnik, "The 'Book of Acts'-the Confirmation of the Gospel," Novum Testamentum, IV, (October, 1960), p. 58. "Acts is the confirmation (βεβαίωσις) of what God did in Christ as told in the first book."

<sup>4</sup>Ὅτι ἡρξάτο Ἰησοῦς ποιεῖν τε καὶ διδάσκειν may suggest in the context that Luke is about to describe in some manner the continued activity of that life which was the subject of his former work. Bo Reicke, Glaube und Leben der Urgemeinde, pp. 9-10. But cf. Lake and Cadbury, The Beginnings

cerning which instructions were given to the apostles *διὰ πνεύματος*  
*ἀγίου*<sup>1</sup> before Jesus was taken up from them (1:2). In view  
 of the fact that at the time of Luke's writing the eschatological posi-  
 tion of the church in relation to the Kingdom of God was<sup>a</sup> vital question,<sup>2</sup>  
 he recounts explicitly the pertinent post-resurrection tradition as known  
 to him to afford the answer. The instructions concerning the descent of  
 the Spirit (1:4-6) are set in the context of the Kingdom as connected by  
 Jesus himself to the crucial events of his own life during the extended  
 period of his appearances to them (1:3; cf. I Cor. 15:4-7). Jesus' final  
 command<sup>3</sup> to them was to tarry in Jerusalem<sup>4</sup> for that which the Father has  
 promised (cf. Lk. 24:49)--the baptism of the Holy Spirit (*ἐν π. ἁ.*)  
 set in eschatological contrast to John's baptism by water (1:4-5; cf.  
 11:16; Mk. 1:8; Acts 19:4). This general command is presented as the  
 basis for the disciples' question which reflects not only a nationalistic  
 (and possible apocalyptic) misunderstanding on their part but also in

---

of Christianity, Vol. IV, p. 3.

<sup>5</sup>Haenchen, p. 106, n. 11.

<sup>1</sup>This may possibly qualify *οὗς ἐξελέξατο* rather than  
*ἐν τε ἰλαρίῳ καὶ ἡμεῖς τ. α.* So Haenchen, p. 108, who remarks  
 that "Lukas verdeutlicht damit dem Leser die Autorität der  
 Apostel."

<sup>2</sup>Reicke, *Glaube und Leben der Urgemeinde*, p. 17. Haenchen, on  
 vs. 6, p. 111. Cf. Conzelmann, pp. 135-169.

<sup>3</sup>Reicke points out that according to the canons of form-  
 criticism the meals of Luke 24:41-43 and Acts 1:4 with the  
 instructions which follow form a "testament." This last point  
 (Endpunkt) of Jesus' earthly history but "zugleich als den Aus-  
 gangspunkt der Kirchengeschichte . . . , in der sich die Ges-  
 chichte der irdischen Meisters fortsetzt." Ibid., pp. 10-11.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Is. 2:2-3; 4:2-3.

Luke's use of it the more pressing problem of the relation of the Spirit as a sign of the inbreaking of the end time to the promised fulfilment of the Kingdom: "Kommt jetzt mit dem Geist das Reich?"<sup>1</sup> The solution is to be found along two lines. Through the instrumentality of the Holy Spirit they are now to be the effective witnesses of the Lord with whom the Kingdom is inseparately connected (1:8); thus the coming of the Spirit is at least a preliminary manifestation of the Kingdom.<sup>2</sup> Alongside this primary emphasis the account of the Ascension (1:9-11) indicates that Jesus has ascended in a definite sense to heavenly dignity and authority from whence he will in God's own time appear to consummate the Kingdom.<sup>3</sup> To effect the presence of the Kingdom is now the function of the Holy Spirit as it enables the disciples to bear witness to Jesus in full import of his salvation significance<sup>4</sup> εἰς ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς and until he comes again. The eschatological role of the now risen

<sup>1</sup>Haenchen, p. 111. Bound up with this question is a second: "Ist das Reich auf Israel begrenzt?"--the problem of the mission to the heathen which is a major concern throughout Acts. Cf. Frank Stagg, The Book of Acts, The Early Struggle for an Unhindered Gospel, (Nashville: The Broadman Press, 1955), pp. 1, 12ff. who finds the major purpose of Acts epitomized in its final word ἀκωλύτως, i.e., to show "the liberation of the gospel as it breaks through barriers that are religious, social, and national."

<sup>2</sup>Reicke, Glaube und Leben der Urgemeinde, p. 17. Cf. H. J. Cadbury, The Making of Luke - Acts (2nd ed.; London: S. P. C. K., 1958), pp. 287f., who concludes that "such associations of Spirit and kingdom tend to spiritualize eschatology, but they also have the tendency to eschatologize the Spirit."

<sup>3</sup>Lampe, p. 193, takes the promise of the heavenly witnesses to be the answer to the apostle's question of 1:6.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Hermann Strathmann, "μάρτυς, μαρτυρέω, μαρτυρία, μαρτυροῦμαι," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. Gerhard Kittel (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1942), IV, 405-497.



and ascended Crucified One is to be performed in the world by the Holy Spirit through the disciples. One could almost already from these verses state that the Holy Spirit is the resurrection power of the ascended Christ released in the midst of those faithful to him.

Now that the stage has been set for the descent of the Spirit by the open instruction and visible ascension of Jesus, Luke presents the disciples' preparation for that event in a two fold-manner (1:12-14; 1:15-26).<sup>1</sup> Those who were at the scene of the Ascension in part as the nucleus of the emerging church<sup>2</sup> returned to Jerusalem where they firmly adhered with corporate unity ( $\delta\mu\omicron\theta\upsilon\mu\alpha\delta\omicron\upsilon\tau$ )<sup>3</sup> to their customary prayers ( $\tau\eta\ \eta\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\epsilon\upsilon\chi\eta$ ).<sup>4</sup> Already they were being formed into a qualitatively new "corporate totality" conditioned by the expectant situation which had been created by the resurrection and ascension of Jesus.<sup>5</sup> This can perhaps be styled their inner or spiritual preparation.

<sup>1</sup>R. B. Rackham, The Acts of the Apostles, Westminster Commentaries, ed. Walter Lock (9th ed.; London: Methuen & Co., 1922) p. 14.

<sup>2</sup>Haenchen, p. 119.

<sup>3</sup>Reicke, Glaube und Leben der Urgemeinde, p. 21, points out this signifies not "die Einheit der Gefühle, sondern . . . die Einheit der Individuen als einer korporativen Totalität." cf. 2:1 var.; 2:46; 4:24; 5:12; 7:57; 8:6; 12:20; 15:25; 18:12; 19:29; Ro. 15:6.

<sup>4</sup>C. S. C. Williams, pp. 57f. But cf. Jackson and Lake, The Beginnings of Christianity, Vol. IV, pp. 10f. for the suggestion that  $\tau\eta\ \eta\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\epsilon\upsilon\chi\eta$  indicates here that the first Christians formed themselves into a synagogue.

<sup>5</sup> $\delta\mu\omicron\theta\upsilon\mu\alpha\delta\omicron\upsilon\tau$  in general indicates a unity within a group dependent upon something without the group which elicits their joint reaction or co-operation. Cf. Demosthenes, 10, 59. It is interesting to note that it occurs 36 times in the LXX for  $\tau\eta\ \eta\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\epsilon\upsilon\chi\eta$  and  $\gamma' \tau\eta\ \eta\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\epsilon\upsilon\chi\eta$  Wolfgang Heiland, " $\delta\mu\omicron\theta\upsilon\mu\alpha\delta\omicron\upsilon\tau$ ," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. Gerhard Friedrich (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1954), V. 185f.

The second phase in the preparation of this group who were thus ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ <sup>1</sup> (1:15) was more outer and formal but none-the-less essential. The defection of Judas had left a gap in the Twelve as the representative nucleus of the new people of God. Peter, resting his case upon the Scriptures, called for a replacement by one who having associated with them since John's baptism could qualify as they to be an apostolic witness of Jesus' resurrection in line with the pre-eminence of that function in relation to the work of the coming Spirit (cf. 4:33). Thus in the obedient response of unity in purpose and representative completeness they awaited that which Peter was soon to announce in ringing eschatological tones as τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ εἰρημένον διὰ τοῦ ηγορήτου Ἰωήλ (2:16). Implied even in these intervening preparatory events is the heilsgeschichtlich continuity between the eschatological role of Jesus and the Holy Spirit. As in Jesus human personality became the supreme organ of the Spirit of God in eschatological action, now the ministry and mission of Jesus is to be carried on by that same Holy Spirit in and through the individuals of the community in renewed corporate unity.

The eschatological experience of the Holy Spirit.--The Holy Spirit descended upon the Primitive Church as the eschatological action of God in fulfilment of promise.<sup>2</sup> Luke reports that the initial impact

<sup>1</sup>This phrase seems to be used by Luke with similar connotations to ὁμοθυμαδόν. Cf. 2:1, 44, 47 and F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, pp. 75, 101. It likewise reproduces תת<sup>2</sup> and תת<sup>2</sup> in the LXX, cf. Zimmermann, p. 76.

<sup>2</sup>For the eschatological significance of the Spirit in the O.T. and Judaism see above pp. 179-181.

of the Spirit came early on the Day of Pentecost<sup>1</sup> as the disciples were  $\delta\mu\omicron\nu\ \epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\ \tau\omicron\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\ \ (2:1)$ --united in purpose and action in respect to the command and promise of Jesus. The attendant phenomena of the sound like rushing wind (2:2; cf. Ezek. 37:9-14) and the appearance of the distributed tongues like fire upon each of them (2:3; cf. Ex. 3:2-6; Mt. 3:11; Lk. 3:16) signified the Divine presence in eschatological action individually experienced.<sup>2</sup> In like manner the occurrence of  $\epsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\alpha\iota\varsigma\ \gamma\lambda\acute{\omega}\sigma\sigma\alpha\iota\varsigma\ \ (2:4)$ , apart from the difficult question of its exact nature, manifests in the Lukan context (2:4-11) the eschatological function of the promised Spirit to be that primarily of prophetic witness (1:8).<sup>3</sup> Peter, as he stands up to reply to the reaction of those assembled (2:12-13), is presented as the first example of such inspired witnessing (2:14).<sup>4</sup> His speech (2:15ff.), at a minimum a primitive form of the Christian kerygma,<sup>5</sup> identifies ( $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu\ \tau\omicron\ \dots$ ) the Spirit event with the age of fulfilment forecast by Joel (2:28-32). In a decisive manner  $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \epsilon\sigma\chi\acute{\alpha}\tau\alpha\iota\varsigma\ \eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\iota\varsigma\ \ (2:17)$ ,<sup>6</sup> the End-time,

<sup>1</sup>Lev. 23:15f.; Rabbinic Tradition held it to be the time of the giving of the Law on Sinai. Strack-Billerbeck, II, 597-602. Thus some think that Luke sees in the Spirit the new Torah. Cf. W. L. Knox, p. 81, 84-86.

<sup>2</sup>Haenchen, p. 131.

<sup>3</sup>Lampe, p. 193.

<sup>4</sup> $\alpha\pi\epsilon\phi\theta\acute{\epsilon}\chi\ \xi\alpha\tau\omicron\ \text{Cf. 2:4.}$

<sup>5</sup>F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 19; C. H. Dodd, The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1936-1960), p. 20. See especially the discussion of Reiche, Glaube und Leben der Urgemeinde, pp. 7, 40, "Indirekt aber scheint es sehr wahrscheinlich zu sein, dass die Apostelgeschichte die Verkündigung der Petrus im grossen und ganzen mit einer beachtlichen objectivität wiedergibt."

<sup>6</sup>This phrase in 2:17 replaces the LXX  $\mu\epsilon\tau\grave{\alpha}\ \tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha\ .$  Cf. Is.



has broken into their midst. Prominent too in the quotation is the prophetic task (2:17-18)<sup>1</sup> to be laid upon all by the Spirit (cf. Num. 11:29). The prophecy as quoted from Joel ends with an invitation to salvation in the name of the Lord<sup>2</sup> which alongside the mention of the non-fulfilled cosmic signs (2:19-20) indicates an anticipated eschatology as basic to the primitive kerygma.<sup>3</sup> The Primitive Church saw their experience of the Spirit as a decisive event in the culmination of God's eschatological activity by means of which they were to proclaim its kingdom<sup>4</sup> content in expectation of its final consummation with the parousia. This content is outlined as the sermon proceeds.

Their experience of the Spirit was defined in the primitive kerygma<sup>5</sup> by the eschatological crisis inherent in the life, death and

2:2, ὅτι ἐστὶ ἐν ταῖς ἐσχαταῖς ἡμέραις κ.τ.λ. B has the LXX reading which Haenchen, p. 142, accepts as original adding that "nach der lukanischen Theologie bricht mit der Geistaussgiessung noch nicht die Endzeit an!" But the interpretative terminology is most likely a part of Luke's sources even if the eschatological distinction is valid.

<sup>1</sup>Cf. the extra καὶ προφητεύουσιν (2:18) which does not appear in the LXX.

<sup>2</sup>The O. T. Yahweh is now practically applied to Jesus. Cf. 2:32-36 and F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 90.

<sup>3</sup>The early church figured on a "between time" which is not merely read back into the sources by Luke whose concern is the "church age." Reicke, Glaube und Leben der Urgemeinde, p. 13. But Cf. Conzelmann, pp. 95-97.

<sup>4</sup>"The Holy Spirit is . . . the proleptic 'atmosphere' so to say of the Kingdom." W. C. Van Unnik, p. 45. Cf. p. 46: "In Acts as a whole the eschatological element is strong, but the early Christian church had a somewhat different idea of the Naherwartung than many N.T. scholars of the present time. The primitive church saw the daybreak of the New Age, but instead of counting hours they set out to proclaim the Gospel."

<sup>5</sup>Cf. also 3:12-26; 5:29-32; 10:34-43; 13:16-41. Here of course the concern is primarily with the first speech of Peter, 2:14-

resurrection of Jesus who had now been exalted by God as both Lord and Christ.<sup>1</sup> Having announced the dawning of the age of fulfilment in terms of the prophecy from Joel 2:28-32, Peter proceeds to relate it to the eschatological significance of the ministry of Jesus as "a man attested to you by God with mighty works and wonders and signs which God did through him in your midst" (2:22).<sup>2</sup> Jesus' death is presented as one purposed by God, occasioned by men (2:23; 3:13-14)<sup>3</sup> and vindicated in his resurrection by the power of God (2:24). The latter is established reciprocally by (1) an appeal to a pertinent messianic scripture (vss. 25-31; Ps. 16:8-11)<sup>4</sup> and (2) the disciples' own witness: "This Jesus God raised up, and of that we all are witnesses" (2:32; 3:15; 5:32). And by virtue of the resurrection, as further shown in scripture (2:34-

---

36. Their common thesis is the proclamation "dass Jesus trotz seines Erniedrigung der verherrlichte Herr ist." Bo Reiche, Glaube und Leben der Urgemeinde, p. 44f., when he analyses the common argument. Cf. C. H. Dodd, The Apostolic Preaching and its Development, pp. 21-24.

<sup>1</sup>Oscar Cullmann, The Earliest Christian Confessions, tr. J. K. S. Reid (London: Lutterworth Press, 1942), p. 5, "It is, then, the present Lordship of Christ, inaugurated by His resurrection and exaltation to the right hand of God, that is the centre of the faith of primitive Christianity . . . Its simplest expression is the formula Kyrios Christos."

<sup>2</sup>Δυνάμεις καὶ τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα "Our Lord's miracles were signs of the Messianic Age . . . showing that in Him the divine Kingdom had broken into the world and was in operation (Lk. xi. 20)." F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 91.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. 3:13, 18, 26, for the Servant motif at this phase of the argument.

<sup>4</sup>"The argument is that the words of the Psalm cannot refer to David, since his soul did go to Sheol and his body did see corruption; they must therefore refer to the Messianic King, of whom David was a figure, and in whose name he spoke these words. These words were fulfilled in Jesus of Nazareth, and in no other; therefore Jesus must be the Messiah." Cf. 13:34-

35; Ps. 110:1), Jesus has been exalted at the right hand of God as the messianic Lord of the new Israel<sup>1</sup> (2:33-36; cf. 3:13; 4:11): "God has made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom you crucified" (2:36). This, however, which can be demonstrated from scripture, has been first vindicated in their own experience for Peter's proclamation is that Jesus "being therefore exalted at the right hand of God, and having received from the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he has poured out this which you see and hear" (2:33).<sup>2</sup> Their witness to the exaltation of Jesus as Lord and Christ rests ultimately upon the witness to them of the Holy Spirit (5:30-32) sent by the exalted One who likewise confirms their witness to others (4:33). Just as the earthly Jesus determined the disciples' course before his death, now as the exalted Messiah of Israel he continues by the Holy Spirit to be dynamically constitutive of the new Israel. Their experience of the Holy Spirit was vitally inter-related with their experience of Jesus; it was in reality the effective presence of Jesus as both Lord and Christ.<sup>3</sup> The Spirit

---

37. F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 92.

<sup>1</sup>C. H. Dodd, The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments, p. 22.

<sup>2</sup>W. L. Knox, pp. 84ff. sees a gap in the argument between Jesus' exaltation and his reception of the promised gift of the Spirit which was poured out upon the disciples. This he feels, was an allusion in his sources that Luke missed to Psalm 68 which occurs as a Pentecostal Psalm in the modern Jewish prayerbook. This Psalm was interpreted in Rabbinic theology to refer to Moses' ascent into heaven to receive the Torah which he brought back to men as a prize gained despite angelic opposition. Cf. C. S. C. Williams, p. 68.

<sup>3</sup>Conzelmann, p. 178, insists that for Luke the presence of Christ "cannot be represented by the Spirit, for as a factor in redemptive history the Spirit is allotted a definite place." The function of mediation of the now "Heavenly person" belongs to the idea of "the name." His distinction is perhaps drawn a bit too fine.



which was upon him is now upon them and becomes for them τὸ πνεῦμα Ἰησοῦ (16:7; cf. v.6)<sup>1</sup>.

The continuing reception of the gift of the Holy Spirit, defined in terms of the salvation-significance of Jesus,<sup>2</sup> follows that repentance which is verified by submission to baptism "in the name of Jesus Christ for (ἐῖς) the forgiveness of . . . sins" (2:38) as the community expands. Peter's account of the Spirit-event and resultant accusation, reinforced by the Spirit's witness, struck the hearers with such a sense of judgment (κατενύχησαν τὴν καρδίαν)<sup>3</sup> that they implored Peter and the rest of the apostles, "Brethren, what shall we do?" (2:37). The only adequate action in the face of such judgment is "repent" (μετανοήσατε) and in demonstration of that fact submit (βαπτισθήτω ἕκαστος) to that repentance-baptism (2:38) which no longer is administered as by John (Mk. 1:4; Lk. 3:3) to indicate repentance in anticipation of the Messiah's coming but in recognition (ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ)<sup>4</sup> that the Messiah is present in Jesus

<sup>1</sup>"Jesus is present in a twofold way: as the living Lord in Heaven, and as a figure from the past by means of the picture of him presented by tradition." Ibid, p. 186.

<sup>2</sup>The δωρεά of the Holy Spirit, while inclusive of the charismata as evidence, is here more comprehensively "the saving benefits of Christ's work as applied to the believer by the Spirit." N. B. Stonehouse, "Repentance, Baptism and the Gift of the Holy Spirit," Paul before the Areopagus, (London: The Tyndale Press, 1957), pp. 84-85.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. LXX Ps. 108:16. In 2:40 there are represented in virtue of their rejection of the Messiah as standing under eschatological judgment. F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 99.

<sup>4</sup>Only one distinct baptism, that in the name of Jesus Christ "ist nach Petrus die Bestätigung der Busse, die vor dem Richterthron Jesu Christi verheissungsvoll und notwendig ist." Markus Barth, Die Taufe - Ein Sakrament? (Zurich: Evangelischer Verlag, A. G. Zollikon, 1951), p. 139.

who has been exalted as "both Lord and Christ" (2:36).<sup>1</sup> For now from the crucified and resurrected One alone can God's forgiveness be expected. Thus it is upon the primary demand of repentance, established as valid in baptism,<sup>2</sup> that the free gift of the Spirit is promised. Baptism does not confer the Spirit; it indicates that the way has been prepared by the necessary repentance.<sup>3</sup> Water baptism and that of the Spirit are normally concomitant, but the relation then between them is essentially that of promise (cf. Lk. 3:16-17)--not primarily sacramental, but moral and spiritual. In the words of Markus Barth: "So ist die Buss-taufe nicht nur die gebotene menschliche Entsprechung zum drohenden Gericht, sondern auch die Entsprechung zur Verheissung des Heiligen Geistes."<sup>4</sup> And that promise is far reaching, even "to all that are afar off, every one whom the Lord our God calls to him" (2:39).

So comprehended and so conditioned the Holy Spirit moved on the

---

<sup>1</sup>Hans Hinrich Wendt, Die Apostelgeschichte, Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar Über das Neue Testament, ed. H. A. W. Meyer, (9th ed. rev.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913.) p. 95.

<sup>2</sup>Repentance and forgiveness of sins are respectively the basis and end of both John's (Lk. 3:3) and the first Christian (Acts 2:38) baptism. The essential difference as indicated above, is that the eschatological perspective has changed in view of Jesus Christ and the corresponding gift of the Spirit. Cf. Barth, pp. 140-141.

<sup>3</sup>In 3:19 Peter speaks only of repentance. Cf. Lk. 24:47. Acts 10:47-48 baptism by water is administered after the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Acts stresses the ultimate freedom of the Spirit from human control by the striking differences in the circumstances of the Spirit's coming. E. Schweizer, The Spirit of God, p. 52. Cf. the discussion by Stonehouse "Repentance, Baptism and the Holy Spirit," pp. 82-84, who stresses the subordination of baptism to repentance.

<sup>4</sup>Markus Barth, p. 144. His whole discussion on Acts 2:38, pp. 134-145 is important for the position taken at this point.

day of Pentecost in such a way that the community was miraculously enlarged.<sup>1</sup> Although man's negative was certainly a necessary condition for the unique solidarity of the community,<sup>2</sup> it was not alone sufficient for its ultimate dependence was upon God's positive. Involved as H. W. Robinson put it was "a new experience of God (through Jesus Christ), a new emphasis on the supernatural, a new sense of power."<sup>3</sup> They were "unified by a vital experience of Jesus and the Spirit"<sup>4</sup> resulting in a "new quality of fellowship."<sup>5</sup> Although Luke does not explicitly connect that which he describes as  $\tau\eta\ \kappa\omicron\iota\nu\nu\eta\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  (2:42) with the Holy Spirit,<sup>6</sup> it cannot be accounted for otherwise;<sup>7</sup> and indeed the direct relation is implied as 2:42 characterizes the community which has just been constituted by the new, constant, individual, inward and yet shared presence

---

<sup>1</sup>Three thousand in round number. Cf. Reicke, Glaube und Leben der Urgemeinde, pp. 52f.

<sup>2</sup>Karl Barth, commentary on Romans 3:23, insists that "there is no positive possession of man which is sufficient to provide a foundation for human solidarity. . . . Genuine fellowship is grounded upon a negative: it is grounded upon what men lack. Precisely when we recognize that we are sinners do we perceive that we are brothers." The Epistle to the Romans, tr. Edwyn C. Hoskyns from 6th German edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933), pp. 100f.

<sup>3</sup>H. Wheeler Robinson, The Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit, (London: Nisbet & Co., 1928), p. 14.

<sup>4</sup>P. G. S. Hopwood, The Religious Experience of the Primitive Church (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1936), p. 150.

<sup>5</sup>Flew, p. 151.

<sup>6</sup>E. Schweizer, The Spirit of God, p. 44, n. 4, criticizes<sup>ci</sup> any connection of the Holy Spirit with the community life of the early Church of Luke stating that for him "it is not moral renewal but missionary enterprise which is the gift of the Spirit."

<sup>7</sup>C. S. C. Williams, p. 293.



of the Holy Spirit.<sup>1</sup> Thus whatever its manifestation, the koinonia "quality of life" of the Primitive Church rests indispensably upon their common experience of the eschatological Spirit--"the signal of the new and eternal covenant."<sup>2</sup> The presence in the community of the Holy Spirit, whose significance for redemption history as indicated in Luke's account of the Jerusalem Church in Acts has been presented in this section, provides the fundamental and formative setting for the koinonia reality whose further description follows:

#### The Community Consciousness

Pentecost constituted the early disciples a community in the deepest sense. In terms of the distinction stressed by Macmurray<sup>3</sup> they were united more than organically by a common purpose. Their first principle of unity was personal--the sharing of a common life. They shared a common life in Christ brought now to an effective realization by the Holy Spirit. It was a new sense of covenant unity which pervaded the post-Pentecost community. Those who believed were characterized as being "of one heart and soul" (4:32). The Lukan accounts, perhaps somewhat idealized,<sup>4</sup> witness to a spontaneous reaction to and expression of the new activity of God in their midst. It was first of all "a fact

---

<sup>1</sup>G. S. Caird, The Apostolic Age, (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., 1955), p. 67: "the Spirit was recognized from the first as the source of unity and harmony."

<sup>2</sup>W. C. Van Unnik, p. 45.

<sup>3</sup>John Macmurray, Conditions of Freedom, (London: Faber and Faber, 1950), pp. 54-56, distinguishes between two types of human association, one "which is constituted by a common purpose" and "another which consists in the sharing of a common life." The first he designates a "society" and the second a "community." The two are not mutually exclusive, but the first

lived out rather than thought out"<sup>1</sup> that gave impetus to a new social creation. Those already described as *ὁμοθυμαδόν* (1:14) and *ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ* (1:15; 2:1) remain *ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ* (2:44) and *ὁμοθυμαδόν* (2:46; 4:24; 5:12)<sup>2</sup> with a new inward compulsion to unity. It is significant that this intensified corporate consciousness was integrally linked with the Temple. In 2:46 Luke reports that: *καθ' ἡμέραν τε προσκαρτεροῦντες ὁμοθυμαδόν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ* and adds in 5:12: *καὶ ἦσαν ὁμοθυμαδόν πάντες ἐν τῇ στοᾷ Σολομῶντος*. That is, as a corporate totality<sup>3</sup> they both continued daily in the temple worship (3:1) and often used the Temple as a meeting place.<sup>4</sup> They understood themselves to be Israel--the new Israel of the End-time.<sup>5</sup> Within this context lay their sense of true community, their "einmalig besondere Gemeinschaftsleben . . . in der gottesdienstlichen Verbundenheit"<sup>6</sup> which Luke conveys by *τῇ κοινωρίᾳ*. What now is to

principle of the former is organic and functional and of the latter personal.

<sup>4</sup>Zimmermann, p. 81. Johannes Weiss, Earliest Christianity, ed. F. C. Grant (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1959), 1, 7.

<sup>1</sup>Johnston, p. 59.

<sup>2</sup>Interesting too is Luke's characteristic use of *προσκαρτερέω* (1:14; 2:42, 46).

<sup>3</sup>Reicke, Glaube und Leben der Urgemeinde, pp. 60f.

<sup>4</sup>The disciples may even have been in the Temple precincts (2:1) when the Holy Spirit first descended upon them. F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 81.

<sup>5</sup>Cf. Eduard Schweizer, Gemeinde und Gemeindeordnung im Neuen Testament, (Zurich: Zwingli Verlag, 1959), pp. 28-31. Their self-understanding at this point was different from that of the Qumran sect. Cf. Joachim Jeremias, "The Qumran Texts and the New Testament," Expository Times (1958), pp. 68-69.

<sup>6</sup>Gerhard Dellling, Der Gottesdienstleben im Neuen Testament

be observed is the living out of their heightened community consciousness.

"All things in common"---A very revealing feature of the early Christian community consciousness was their practice which Luke described as εἶχον ἅπαντα κοινά (2:44; cf. 4:32). Although the summary description of the matter (2:42-47; 4:32-5:11) may be expressed somewhat in terms of hellenistic idealism,<sup>1</sup> one can take seriously the main features of Luke's account. These can be summed up as three: first, their sense of oneness as a believing people wrought in them the conviction that in their midst was a reality which could supersede even their right to their own property (4:32; 2:44). Second, thus motivated, there were those among them who voluntarily (cf. 4:36-37; 5:4) as the need arose sold their property and laid it at the apostles' feet to be distributed to those in need (2:44-45; 4:34-35). Third, the result, at least for a time, was that there was none among them in need (4:34). The imperfect tense of the verbs in 2:45 and 4:34 indicates that the sale of property was not a single concerted action but a continuing process.<sup>2</sup> Here was no socialistic scheme modeled after hellenistic patterns.

---

(Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1952), p. 124. Reicke, Glaube und Leben der Urgemeinde, p. 60, points out from 2:44-47a that they all lived "in einem ununterbrochenen Gottesdienst."

<sup>1</sup>Hauck, p. 797, comments: "Die Formel ἅπαντα κοινὰ εἶχον mit der Lk idealisierend (2, 44: ἅπτες : 4,34: ὅσοι ; doch 4, 36; 3, 1-4) das völlige Gemeinschaftsleben in der Erstzeit der Urgemeinde schildert, ist hellenistisch, nicht biblisch." Cf. Zimmermann, pp.81-82. Pöhlmann, 11 pp. 611f. For the Greek parallels see above pp. 109-119.

<sup>2</sup>Caird, pp. 78f. There were those who continued to retain their property, for example "the house of Mary the mother of John" (Acts 12:12).



Hort's characterization is apt:

There was no merging of all private possessions in a common stock, but a voluntary and variable contribution on a large scale. That is to say, the Ecclesia was a society in which neither the community was lost in the individual, nor the individuals in the community.<sup>1</sup>

The nearest parallel may be that of the organized Jewish charity which flourished in the second century and perhaps also in the first.<sup>2</sup> The Qumran practice in the matter of common property which Burrows indicates as "perhaps the most striking feature in which the Jerusalem Church and the Qumran community were alike"<sup>3</sup> was more similar to the hellenistic ideal. Community of property was part of their organized pattern of life and every one who after two years as a novice became a full-fledged member was obliged to give over irrevocably his personal property (IQS 1:12; 5:2; 6:18-23) for common use.<sup>4</sup>

In contrast to the Qumran practice the sharing of goods in the early Church was more ethically than eschatologically motivated. The former conceived of their community of property as indispensable to that "perfecting of the way" which alone would allow them their chosen role in the expected eschatological crises.<sup>5</sup> Their eschatology demanded

---

<sup>1</sup>Fenton John Anthony Hort, The Christian Ecclesia, (London: Macmillan and Co., 1908), p. 48.

<sup>2</sup>Kirsopp Lake, "The Communism of Acts II, and IV-VI, and the appointment of the Seven," Additional Notes to the Commentary, ed. Kirsopp Lake and Henry J. Cadbury, Vol. V. The Beginnings of Christianity, ed. F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, (London: Macmillan and Co., 1933), p. 148. Cf. Moore, II, 176 ff.; Strack-Billerbeck, II pp. 641-647.

<sup>3</sup>Burrows, More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 116.

<sup>4</sup>Josephus Antiquities XVII 1, 5; Bellum Judaicum II 8, 3; Philo Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit 85-87; Hypothetica 11:4. Cf. Sutcliffe, pp. 91-97.

<sup>5</sup>See above pp. 145, 153-159. Cf. Burrows, More Light on the

B/

that they prepare in this manner--it was motivation from without by an anticipated eschatology. And on that basis the existence of an effective spirit of brotherhood among them is not to be denied.<sup>1</sup> The ethic, however, of the first Christians that gave fulfilment to the ancient promise: "there will be no poor among you" (Deut. 15:4) was a spontaneous expression of a realized eschatology. The practice of πάντα κοινά was the working out of the καρδιά καὶ ψυχὴ μία which had been worked in and because of which οὐδε εἰς τι τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτῷ ἔλεγε ἴδιον εἶναι. Under the immediate pressure of Pentecost they gave evidence of a more realistic apprehension of that "life-together" (Lk. 8:1-3; Jn. 12:4-8; 13:29) which they had formerly known in the company of the earthly Jesus. For integral to their practical expression of love one-to-another was their continued following of Jesus by means of the dynamic of the Spirit's presence. As T. W. Manson put it, "to follow Christ is not to go in pursuit of an ideal, but to share in the results of an achievement."<sup>2</sup> It is not without significance that placed abruptly in Luke's second description of the sharing of goods (4:32ff.) is the declaration: "and with great power the apostles gave their testimony to the resurrection of the Lord Jesus and great grace was upon them all (4:33). The covenant ΤΟ Π of the Old Testament, uniquely fulfilled in the teaching, deeds and person of Jesus, has now found effective manifestation in the "life-together" of those who are now disciples of the ascended Lord. It was Jesus' own

---

Dead Sea Scrolls, pp. 142-152.

<sup>1</sup>Philo Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit 91.

<sup>2</sup>T. W. Manson, Ethics and the Gospel, p. 59.

attitude toward property (Lk. 12:33; 14:33; Mt. 6:19ff.) and the nature of the inner disciple relationship (Mk. 10:42-45; Lk. 22:24-27; Mt. 20:24-28)<sup>1</sup> that was now almost ideally brought to fruition in their relation through their experience of the Holy Spirit to Jesus as Lord: "in brief, Jesus' power over their souls was now at last fully realized".<sup>2</sup> Their amazing demonstration of brotherly love was thus prompted more by the spontaneous ethic of a newly effected relation to God than by an imminent eschatological expectation.<sup>3</sup> The ancient proverb: κοινὰ τὰ φιλῶν is filled with new dimension and dynamic.

The "all things in common" witnesses to an eloquent expression of a potent sense of unity directed towards the brother in need. "They partook of food with glad and generous (ἀφελότητι)<sup>4</sup> hearts" (2:46) for their sharing of goods took place primarily within the context of the common meal (cf. 6:2).<sup>5</sup> This particular "first blush" manner of manifestation did not long endure as such. As is seen in the account of Ananias and Sapphira (5:1-11) in contradistinction to that of Barnabas (4:36-37) not all within the community were entirely subject to the Spirit's control. That their togetherness could be effectively real, however, was shown by the inclusion of two distinct language groups

---

<sup>1</sup>See above pp. 194-196.

<sup>2</sup>Weiss, p. 44.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Caird, p. 79; Thornton, pp. 7f.

<sup>4</sup>F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 101. The meaning of ἀφελότητι here, however, may be "simplicity", i. e. their singlemindedness towards the things of God. Arndt and Gingrich, p. 124.

<sup>5</sup>Rackham, p. 37.



within the common life--the Hebrews and the Hellenists.<sup>1</sup> But this very difference of language would inevitably tend to create two distinct social units and this could easily become a source of friction. Such a condition is reported in Acts 6:1-6 where the Hellenists complained against the Hebrews that their widows were being neglected in the daily distribution. This was partly due, probably, to the enlarging responsibility of the apostles (cf. 6:24). Positive measures now need to be taken to ensure the overall unity of the community for it had become evident that the proper spontaneous or intuitive reaction of all could not be fully relied upon. The apostles choose seven of the Hellenists,<sup>2</sup> *ἡλλήρεις πνεύματος καὶ σοφίας* whom they ordained to the task of distribution. Thus the unanimity was not always perfect, but the important fact is that when such an occasion arose, the apostles were quick to avert any real breach in fellowship by their most magnanimous decision. The pattern was changing, but the motivation and dynamic remained constant in this most impressive manifestation of the koinonia

<sup>1</sup>The two terms *Ἑλληνιστοί* and *Ἑβραῖοι* in the context refer best to Greek and Aramaic speaking Jews respectively. Haenchen, pp. 213-214. C. F. D. Moule, "Once More, Who Were the Hellenists", *The Expository Times* LXX 4 (January, 1959), pp. 100-102, posits that the terms refer to "'Jews who spoke only Greek', and 'Jews who, while able to speak Greek', knew a Semitic language also." Other suggestions include "Gentiles," Henry J. Cadbury, "The Hellenists," *Additional Notes to the Commentary*, ed. Kirsopp Lake and Henry J. Cadbury, Vol. V. *The Beginnings of Christianity*, ed. F. J. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake (London: Macmillan and Co., 1933), pp. 59-74; "Jews who represented a Hellenistic Syncretism," Cullmann, "The Significance of the Qumran Texts for Research into the Beginnings of Christianity," pp. 25-30; "proselytes," Reicke, *Glaube und Leben der Urgemeinde*, pp. 116-117. It is not to be denied that there were proselytes among the Hellenists, for example, "Nicolaus, a proselyte of Antioch" (6:5) was among the seven.

<sup>2</sup>F. F. Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles*, p. 153.

in the early church at Jerusalem.

Other features of the common life.--Luke intended by  $\tau\eta\ \kappa\omicron\iota\nu\nu\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  in 2:42 to designate one of the fundamental marks of the early Christian community--their unique quality of life-together. This in primary essence was dynamically constituted by their "sharing-together" in the new eschatological action of God through their experience of the Spirit, the most impressive manifestation being the way in which they cared for the needy in their midst. Luke's account indicates, however, that this consciousness of oneness was characteristic of every aspect of their common eschatological existence, and indeed, these other distinguishing features of the Primitive Church were often contributory to that unity. Four phases of the life of the early church especially deserve mention.

In Acts 2:42 Luke first characterized the church as  $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\text{-}\kappa\alpha\rho\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \tau\eta\ \delta\iota\delta\alpha\chi\eta\ \tau\omega\nu\ \alpha\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\acute{o}\lambda\omega\nu$ .<sup>1</sup> There is little doubt that the first Christians were marked by their fairly consistent attendance together upon the sessions of apostolic instruction both in the Temple and in their homes (cf. 2:46; 5:21, 42). Luke's emphasis, however, in his summary statement is on their adherence in faith and life to that which the disciples were teaching.<sup>2</sup> Like the parallel  $\tau\eta\ \kappa\omicron\iota\nu\nu\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  it is the qualitative result of a logically antecedent process

<sup>1</sup>Hort, p. 44, notes that attendance upon the teachings of the apostles was "a mark of fellowship." Cf. Flew, p. 154.

<sup>2</sup>Arndt and Gingrich, p. 191; Karl Heinrich Rengstorff, " $\delta\iota\delta\alpha\chi\eta$ ", "Theologische Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. Gerhard Kittel (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1935), II, 166; Seesemann, p. 88. But cf. Reicke, Glaube und Leben der Urgemeinde, p. 57.

which is intended.<sup>1</sup> They were united in their devotion to what the apostles taught them, which in turn was an integral factor in the community consciousness. Their teaching was in line with their ordained function as witnesses of Jesus (Acts. 1:2, 8, 21-28) and certainly contained a kerygmatic element (cf. 4:2, 18; 5:21, 28, 42).<sup>2</sup> They were those who were in the company of Jesus "beginning from the baptism of John until the day he was taken up" (1:22). Their teaching then contained their witness to the life and teaching of Jesus,<sup>3</sup> including the final events, all interpreted in the light of Scripture and the observable event of Pentecost.<sup>4</sup> It was "the Gospel itself . . . together with the fuller teaching about worship and life and conduct."<sup>5</sup> This authoritative teaching, to those who were new in the community (2:41, 47; 4:4), gave definitive content to their newfound relationship to God by the Holy Spirit, and complementary to the working of the Spirit in their midst was a factor towards the effecting of their solidarity.

Luke's third characteristic of the early church life in 2:42,

---

<sup>1</sup>See above pp. 88.

<sup>2</sup>The sermons of chapters 2-5 surely indicate certain elements in the apostolic didache. C. F. D. Moule concludes that "something like Peter's sermon, followed by something like the Didache, will be what is meant by the teaching of the Apostles," Christ's Messengers (London: Lutterworth Press, 1957), p. 72. The line between didache and kerygma is not hard and fast. Cf. Flew, pp. 154-155. H. G. Wood, "Didache, Kerygma and Evangelion," New Testament Essays, ed. A. J. B. Higgins (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959), pp. 306-314.

<sup>3</sup>For the probable content of this teaching the principal source is the Synoptic Gospels. Caird, pp. 75-78.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Luke 24:44-49; Acts 1:1-8.

<sup>5</sup>C. F. D. Moule, Christ's Messengers, p. 72.



the activity described as  $\tau\eta\ \kappa\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\iota\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\omicron\upsilon$ , is perhaps the most definitive factor in the expression of their brotherhood.<sup>1</sup> It has already been noted that the daily distribution to those in need took place primarily within the context of their common meal (cf. 2:44-46; 6:1-2)<sup>2</sup> It partook already of the character of an Agape or Love-Feast.<sup>3</sup> Also this table-fellowship was probably often the occasion for the apostolic instruction to the community.<sup>4</sup> Thus their practice of eating together with its attendant significance can be considered both formative and basically expressive of the koinonia.

The role of the common meal as a seal of solidarity needs no further emphasis here.<sup>5</sup> The question is rather the character of its practice in the first Christian community particularly in respect to the designation  $\tau\eta\ \kappa\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\iota\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\omicron\upsilon$ . That it had religious associa-

<sup>1</sup>Rackham, p. 37.

<sup>2</sup>Reicke, Diakonie, Festfreude und Zelos, p. 25, who maintains that  $\tau\eta\ \kappa\omicron\iota\nu\nu\eta$  designates the practice of distribution, connects it closely in 2:42 with  $\tau\eta\ \kappa\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\iota\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\omicron\upsilon$ . While one cannot agree with this exclusive connotation for koinonia here, his discussion points up the close connection between the two practices. He thus sees the practice as religiously and liturgically grounded in continuity with Old Testament and Jewish custom. Cf. pp. 25-28; 167-185. D. M. Stanley, p. 26, writing as a Roman Catholic, would put the relation perhaps even more strongly than Reicke saying that "the Eucharistic liturgy provided the motivation and supernatural dynamism which effectively realized this remarkable experiment in the practice of Christian social justice."

<sup>3</sup>Rackham, p. 37.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. 2:46; 5:42; 20:7. Stanley would here too suggest "that the 'teaching of the apostles' was . . . effectively inspired by 'the breaking of Bread'." There was a "liturgical influence upon Christian teaching." P. 26.

<sup>5</sup>See above pp. 128f., 163f., 204ff. Cf. *IQS* 6:7-6; *IQS<sup>a</sup>* 2:17-22.

tions going beyond those of the ordinary is evident from the tenor of the account (2:42-47).<sup>1</sup> It was an integral part of their communal religious life. More than that it is quite probable that the highlight of their daily meals together was the observance of the Eucharist.<sup>2</sup> The name "the breaking of bread" became applied to the meal in view of the unparalleled significance given to that act which normally began a Jewish meal (cf. Mk. 6:41; Acts 27:35)<sup>3</sup> by the parabolic action of Jesus at the Last Supper at which he first of all broke bread and gave it to his disciples saying, "this is my body" (Mk. 14:22). This act as performed by the first Christians was a concrete and rich expression of "the unity of the many as partakers of the one Divine sustenance"<sup>4</sup> (cf. I Cor. 10:17). By means of it they daily realized their solidarity as common participants in the Kingdom victory accomplished by Jesus as sealed to them by the Resurrection and their experience of the Spirit. As Cullmann<sup>5</sup> stresses; it was a continuation of the resurrection meal (Lk. 24:

<sup>1</sup>Note the proximity of "prayers" in vs. 42, Temple attendance in verse 46, and the note of joy and praise there sounded.

<sup>2</sup>Higgins, The Lord's Supper and the New Testament, pp. 56f. Bo Reicke, Diakonie, Festfreude und Zelos, pp. 9-11. But cf. D. Johannes Behm, "κλῶν, κλῆσις, κλῆσμα," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. Gerhard Kittel (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1938), III, 728.

<sup>3</sup>Dalman, Jesus-Jeschua, p. 136.

<sup>4</sup>Hort, p. 44.

<sup>5</sup>Cullmann, "The Meaning of the Lord's Supper in Primitive Christianity," Essays on the Lord's Supper, pp. 5-16. He gives a one-sided account of these meals based on the silence in connection with them of Jesus' death and the drinking of the wine. There is no doubt that the positive note of joyful eschatological realization was the dominant one, but it cannot be posited as the exclusive motif. Paul, for example, in Acts 20:7 where only the one element is mentioned in the description of the practice, would most probably have included the drinking

30-35) in which they knew afresh the presence of their Lord. It was, however, in the import of the Resurrection as that of the one who had been crucified for them that they experienced his presence. The Eleven were not far removed from the impact of the Last Supper. Thus it was a newly effected covenant relationship with God and the hope of its full consummation that the exalted Lord brought to fruition in their midst. It was this which allowed them to take their food "with glad and generous hearts, praising God."<sup>1</sup> In "the breaking of bread" was their united sharing in the new and promising eschatological action of God as a unique quality of life-together most effectively sealed and expressed. The redemptive reality was here supremely made manifest and by virtue of that manifestation was certainly formative for the expression of the koinonia<sup>2</sup> in every other phase of the life of the Primitive Church. "The breaking of bread" as the central and characteristic action of their koinonia lay from the beginning at the heart of their distinctive manner of worship.<sup>3</sup>

Indicative of and indispensable to the koinonia was yet another phase of their corporate life to which Luke gives equal emphasis along side of the other characteristic marks of the early church, in 2:42 namely, ταῖς προσευχαῖς . By continuing unitedly (ἑνωθυσάμενοι)

of the wine.

<sup>1</sup>Delling, p. 30, points out that ἀγαλλίασις for Luke is a technical term for Spirit-inspired eschatological joy. Cf. Lk. 1:47; 10:21, Acts 16:34. Reicke, Diakonie, Festfreude und Zelos, pp. 202-206, discusses at length the phrase in 2:46 in the context of the early Christian daily celebration.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. the close connection between the phrases in I Cor. 10:16.

<sup>3</sup>Thornton, pp. 332f.

JP  
1 es



in "the prayers" they exhibited a corporate oneness before Pentecost that was preparatory to the coming of the Spirit (1:14). The expression, "the prayers" (1:14; 2:42; 6:4), referred primarily to the regular worship of the Church<sup>1</sup> held no doubt both within and without the temple (1:14; 2:46; 4:23; 12:12) in which prayer was an integral part. It is possible that attendance upon the regular temple services (cf. 2:46; 3:1)<sup>2</sup> is included in the reference of the phrase as well. Perhaps most significant for present purposes is the example afforded by Luke in 4:23-31 as typical<sup>3</sup> of the prayer which characterized their gatherings. The apostles returned to the group (τοὺς ἑδούς 4:23) to report their appearance before the council after which they joined together (συνεθυσμαδόν) in prayer. In this instance the substance of the prayer was for continued power to witness (παρρησία)<sup>4</sup> in the face of mounting persecution: "And now, Lord, look upon their threats, and grant to thy servants to speak thy word with all boldness" (4:39). The answer was a renewed consciousness of the Spirit's presence (4:31) granting to them the requested boldness. They evidenced in their praying their unitedness of faith and life in its appointed task, and in that corporate action the koinonia was reinforced under the fresh impact of the Holy Spirit. Thus it was very fitting for Luke to introduce his

---

<sup>1</sup>F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 152.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Josephus Antiquities XIV 4, 3; Exodus 29:39, 40.

<sup>3</sup>Reicke, Glaube und Leben der Urgemeinde, p. 81.

<sup>4</sup>Ordinarily in non-Biblical Greek the democratic right of free speech. Here the implication is the forthright and confident manner in which the apostles are enabled to speak under the influence of the Holy Spirit. Cf. 4:8, 13. F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 121.

next unit of thought with "now the company of those who believed were of one heart and soul . . . " (4:32).

A fourth phase of the life of the early Christians in which the exhibition and function of the koinonia ought not to be overlooked is that which is an intended function of those already discussed--their united witness as a Heilsgemeinde. In fact Acts throughout is first concerned with the witness of the community to Jesus Christ (1:8; 4:29-33; 5:32) and the expansion of τοῦ λόγου τοῦ Θεοῦ (4:31)<sup>1</sup>. This is a vital element, for the effectiveness of its witness must ever concern the church if it is to remain such! The integral relation of a proper community consciousness to the task of proclamation is surely implied in 4:32-35. There in the midst of the account of the amazing unanimity of spirit which prevailed in the community and its striking effect in the community of goods Luke interposes a remark as to the power with which the apostles were able to give testimony to the resurrection of Jesus (4:32).

The role of witness is considered the first function of the same Holy Spirit which had generated the new quality of fellowship among them (1:8; 5:32). The eschatological continuity of the Spirit with Jesus has already been fully discussed.<sup>2</sup> In line with this several things can be observed in connection with the apostolic witness. They witnessed to a resurrected and exalted Jesus (2:32; 4:2, 33; 5:29-32; 7:55); they performed their wonders in the name of Jesus (3:6; 4:10, 30; cf. 5:40-41),

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. 4:4; 6:2, 7; 10:44; 12:24; 16:6; 17:11, 13; 18:11; 19:10, 20.

<sup>2</sup>See above pp. 218ff.

the confidence and forthrightness of the speech of these theologically untrained men was accounted for by their connection with Jesus (4:13) and the dynamic of it all was ascribed to the Holy Spirit. Peter was "filled with the Holy Spirit" (4:8; cf. 7:55; Mt. 10:19-20) as he answered his accusers. On their release from custody Peter and John returned to the group where together they prayed for boldness (*παρρησία*) to speak the word: "and when they had prayed, the place in which they were gathered together was shaken; and they were all filled with the Holy Spirit and spoke the word of God with boldness" (4:31).<sup>1</sup> That Spirit whose continuity with the earthly and now resurrected Jesus had made for their unique oneness likewise empowered their witness to the exalted Lord. Their unity of heart and soul was then concomitant, indeed indispensable, for the effectiveness of their witness to Jesus and the Kingdom (cf. 8:12). One could perhaps view the *koinonia* as the secret behind the tremendous impact of their proclamation in those early days. Only when the church allows the Holy Spirit radically to unify it in heart and soul can its collective witness penetrate those beyond its boundaries. The only really effective witness is collective.<sup>2</sup> The *koinonia* was truly expressed in terms of those without in the context of their witness. Their "sharing-together" was in that Spirit which both made Jesus present to their experience and whose very presence was to

---

<sup>1</sup>Bo Reicke, "The Risen Lord and His Church", *Interpretation* (April, 1959), p. 163 points out that the characteristic use of *λόγος* to designate the message and preaching of Jesus Christ particularly in view of the summary statements which speak of its spread (6:7; 12:24) confirm that "Acts was meant to report what the risen Lord did for his church as a continuation of what Jesus did for his flock."

<sup>2</sup>Cf. C. F. D. Moule, *Christ's Messengers*, p. 92.



the end that its reality might be further shared through the instrumentality of their witness "to all that are afar off. . . " (2:39; cf. 1:8). The "sharing" which bound the first Christians so dramatically together could not be arbitrarily limited in the potential of its outreach lest it contradict itself. It must reach genuinely and openly out to others. That which was basically a shared experience must be shared! This is evident as the chapters that follow in the Acts of the Apostles trace out the manner in which the Gospel was enabled by the Holy Spirit to break through the boundaries of race and religion.

The koinonia moulded by and manifested in every aspect of their life together as a worshipping community, stands indispensably behind the function of the Primitive Church as those who as bearers of the Spirit are continuing the ministry of Jesus. And as their koinonia is focused in the supreme task of witnessing, under the persecution that threatens them (4:1-31; 5:17-42), it becomes a fellowship of suffering<sup>1</sup> consistent with the Servant role of the Lord to whom they witness (4:30)<sup>2</sup>: "they left the presence of the council, rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer dishonour for the name" (5:41). It was given to Stephen (6:5-7:60) to be the first in the Christian context to seal his Spirit-filled witness (6:5, 8, 15; 7:55-56) like his Lord with his death--the first full *μάρτυς* . The "sharing-together quality of life," constituted by a common experience of the eschatological Spirit reaches out to ultimate expression in the messianic mission of the Church.

---

<sup>1</sup>Reicke, Glaube und Leben der Urgemeinde, pp. 80-33.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. 3:13; Isa. 52:13; F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, pp. 107-118,

## The Numinous Quality

A vivid awareness of the supernatural and the holy permeated the first Christian community and characterized its effect upon those without. Those who observed the impact of Pentecost upon the disciples were "bewildered" (2:6), "amazed and wondered" (2:7) and "all were amazed and perplexed" (1:12).<sup>1</sup> Many who heard Peter's Spirit-empowered witness that day "were cut to the heart" crying out "Brethren, what shall we do?" (2:37). Luke's general characterization of the community in this respect is that "fear came upon every soul; and many wonders and signs were done through the apostles" (2:43).<sup>2</sup> Following Pentecost the ministry of the apostles like that of Jesus (cf. 2:22) was attested by God through extraordinary wonders and signs (τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα).<sup>3</sup> One such was the healing of the lame man at the gate of the temple (3:1-10; cf. 5:12-14) at which all "were filled with wonder and amazement" (3:10). Even the council are reported to have designated it "a notable sign" (4:16).<sup>4</sup> Likewise the council are said to have marvelled (ἐθαύμαζον) at the conduct of Peter and John before them as uneducated and common men, accounting for it by their connection with Jesus (4:13).

<sup>1</sup>Cf. the continuity with the effect of Jesus' own ministry (Mk. 1:22; Lk. 5:8).

<sup>2</sup>F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 100, points out that "the imperfect denotes that the fear which fell on all who heard the words of Peter was no momentary panic, but continued to be a feature of the days that followed." Cf. Haenchen, p. 124.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. 5:12. Neither in 2:43 nor in 5:12 does *δυνάμεις* occur as in 2:22 of Jesus. But cf. 8:13 and 19:11.

<sup>4</sup>γνωστὸν σημεῖον. Cf. Haenchen, pp. 177f.

No doubt the common life of the church particularly as expressed in the community of goods can be viewed as one of the most impressive signs and wonders.<sup>1</sup> It is the first phenomenon to be mentioned after the general statement of apostolic signs and wonders in 2:43. And again in 4:32-35 the presence of *δυνάμει μεγάλη* accompanying the apostles' testimony and *χάρις . . . μεγάλη* upon the whole community abruptly placed within the second account of their amazing expression of Christian charity implies that the latter demonstrates the former. So it is not strange that it is within the context of its most striking manifestation that the numinous or holy quality of the koinonia comes to vivid expression in the episode of Ananias and Sapphira (5:1-10). The idea of the holy is integrally linked to the character of their community consciousness.

The sharing of goods is presented as indicative of the inner quality of the community as constituted by the Holy Spirit. The action of Barnabas (4:36-37) is put forth as one which ideally exhibits the true character of that inner quality. The agreed deed of Ananias and Sapphira is set in contrast to that of Barnabas as stressing the same aspect of the community in a negative manner by pointing up the seriousness of its violation. Their hypocrisy was committed upon the ethical plane of their relation to the other members of the community. They pretended to be selflessly demonstrating a Spirit-inspired love as they laid only part of their proceeds from the sale of their property at the apostles' feet.<sup>2</sup> Peter as leader and spokesman (cf. Mt. 16:16-19)<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Rackham, p. 41.

<sup>2</sup>Interesting is the parallel to Achan's act in Joshua 7:1. The LXX uses the same verb as is found in 5:2, *ἐραστόσατο*. Cf.



revealed to Ananias the true dimension of his deception. It was fundamentally in terms of the Holy Spirit, a falsifying<sup>1</sup> of the holiness of the eschatological Spirit by which God had constituted the community. To deceive the church was to lie to God (vs. 4),<sup>2</sup> so completely does the former reside within the sphere of the latter as a Spirit-filled body (2:4; 4:31).

To falsify the Spirit was to lie to God thus it is the "Holy"<sup>3</sup> Spirit that now comes to the fore in the community. It is God's holiness redefined in their midst by Jesus as Lord and Christ (3:14; 4:30)<sup>4</sup> that is now encountered in the Spirit. The demand of that holiness is single obedience to "the Spirit of the Lord" (5:9, cf. 5:32; 7:51).<sup>5</sup>

---

Lake and Cadbury, The Beginning of Christianity, IV, p. 50.  
For the Jewish attitude toward hypocrisy cf. Moore, II, p. 190;  
IQS 6:24-27.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Oscar Cullmann, Peter, Disciple-Apostle-Martyr, tr. Floyd V. Filson (London: S. C. M. Press, 1953) p. 34.

<sup>1</sup>Stagg, pp. 82-83, suggests the possibility of such a translation in view of the unusual accusative in 5:3 over against the more normal dative of 5:4. F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 133, points out that the distinction is "to tell lies to" in vs. 4 and "to deceive" in vs. 3.

<sup>2</sup>In this passage the Holy Spirit is both considered to be personal (vs. 3) and equated with God (vs. 4). F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 133.

<sup>3</sup>The Spirit is qualified as ἅγιος throughout the first chapters of Acts. Cf. 1:2, 5, 8, 16; 2:4, 38; 4:8, 25, 31; 5:3, 32; 6:5; 7:51, 55. Likewise Jesus is ἅγιος 3:14; 4:30. The church is not designated as οἱ ἅγιοι until 9:13. Cf. 9:32, 41.

<sup>4</sup>See above 210ff. Contrast the Qumran conception of holiness above pp. 157ff. Cf. Nötscher, "Heiligkeit in den Qumranschriften," pp. 326-332.

<sup>5</sup>Ragnar Asting, Die Heiligkeit im Ur-christentum, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1930), p. 129.

For in that Spirit is contained the new and present action of God towards his people. It was the nature of that activity which Ananias and Sapphira denied by their deed and thus Peter can ascribe it to a wilful opening of their hearts to Satan. There is a definite continuity between this event and Jesus' teaching on the sin against the Holy Spirit (Mk. 3:28-30; Mt. 12:31-32) as well as a certain similarity to Peter's own conduct at Caesarea Philippi and the tragic denial of Judas. Ananias and Sapphira betrayed from within the very essence of the koinonia by their hypocritical conformity to its spirit, which was in direct contradiction to the Spirit of it. To disobey the Spirit of the Lord is to disrupt the cohesion of the community, so interdependent are they. Thus can be seen the ultimately holy nature of the koinonia and the full seriousness of its violation. The exclusiveness of the community was the ethic of radical personal obedience to that which gave it the dynamic of its being--the Spirit of the Lord.

This seriousness of such sin in the case of Ananias and Sapphira was deeply impressed upon the church and those in contact with it at this early stage. For at the revelation of the true character of his deed<sup>1</sup> Ananias, as did his wife after him, fell dead "and great fear came upon the whole church, and upon all who heard of these things" (5:11). The sequel of the "great power" and "great grace" (4:33) which allowed such a unique unanimity of spirit is "great fear" in respect to its constituted holiness. In the summary statement which follows the church gathers in Solomon's portico when "none of the rest"<sup>2</sup> dared join them, but the people held them in high honour" (5:13). At the same time it is

---

<sup>1</sup>For a discussion of the other elements in this account, cf. Reicke, Glaube und Leben der Urgemeinde, pp. 87-89; Haenchen,

reported that "more than ever believers were added to the Lord, multitudes of men and women" (5:14) in the context of the many signs and wonders which were done among the people at the hands of the apostles. The holy character of the koinonia has been distinctly set as the ethical lines are drawn and defined by the Ananias episode. Luke in 5:11 first employs the word ἐκκλησία perhaps wishing to emphasize that the preceding event in Hort's words "marked an epoch in the early growth of the society, a time when its distinctiveness, and the cohesion of its members, had come to be distinctly recognized without as well as within."<sup>1</sup> The inherent holiness of the koinonia is that of the eschatological action of God defined in Jesus and implemented through the Holy Spirit.

#### Conclusion

In Acts 2:42 Luke employed the expression τῇ κοινῳρίᾳ to connote in a general manner the unique community quality of the Primitive Church. The phrase is a more abstract and comprehensive designation of that which Luke repeatedly stressed by the use of ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ and καρδιά καὶ ψυχὴ μία. The use of this language as summed up by the characterizing τῇ κοινῳρίᾳ is interestingly paralleled in the corresponding employment of τῇ in

---

pp. 192-198; Rackham, pp. 64-67.

<sup>2</sup>Possibly the Jews who did not really believe but might be tempted to join the company of those who enjoyed much popularity. F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 137. Reicke, Glaube und Leben der Urgemeinde, p. 92, suggests a distinct religious party within Judaism.

<sup>1</sup>Horton, p. 49.



the Qumran documents.<sup>1</sup> Although the eschatological context and the salvation content of the two are not identical, the function of the terminology is very similar. In both spheres it lays stress upon an eschatologically conditioned covenant unity with an intense ethical content. Particularly in the light of Philo's<sup>2</sup> use of koinonia to depict the common life of the Essenes is the connection striking.

For Luke the koinonia was a vital and impressive characteristic of the Primitive Church. He presents it in the pristine vigour of its initial emergence under the impact of Pentecost--a spontaneous effect eloquent in the purity and power of its manifestation in every phase of the community life. In essence and in terminology it was a sharing--a quality of life experienced and lived out upon the plane of personal relationship to man and God. The sharing was constituted by an eschatological realization, the new relationship to God in Jesus Christ now dynamically effected by the Holy Spirit. The thrust of this sharing is that by virtue of the former dimension it is constitutive of a new relationship between men. Thus the koinonia is descriptive of the inner or true community character of the first Christian society, particularly as it found expression in ways that exhibited almost ideally its fundamental nature.

This new "quality of life" thus brought to realization among men was in covenant continuity and fulfilment for it was in accomplishment of Jesus' kingdom purpose. The immediate foundation was his messianic ministry. As the now exalted Lord and Christ he is the definitive

---

<sup>1</sup>See above pp. 159-161. Maier, pp. 148-166.

<sup>2</sup>Philo, Hypothetica, 11:1, 14, 16.

content of the koinonia that is continually constituted by the Spirit of the Lord. Its character is his character. The covenant love one to another which found realistic expression within it is that which he taught and demonstrated in the midst of the first disciples. Jesus' stringent demand of radical obedience to the Kingdom resident in his person and ministry is the ethic which attends the koinonia in its dependence upon the Holy Spirit. And the ultimate focus of the koinonia in both its vertical and horizontal dimensions is the continuation of the messianic mission of the Servant in its task of bearing inspired witness to the eschatological activity of God among men.

## CHAPTER VI

### KOINONIA AS EXHIBITED IN THE LETTERS OF PAUL

#### Introduction

The koinonia language occurs most frequently in the letters of the Apostle Paul.<sup>1</sup> He employs the terminology almost always in religious contexts, but since his religious use even of koinonia varies in each instance it can not be viewed as technical. What is significant, however, is that Paul to a greater degree than any other New Testament writer found the koinonia language serviceable as he interpreted and applied the reality of Jesus Christ. He uses the language often in a peculiarly rich manner as he makes reference to and brings to bear on the particular problem at hand the "sharing-together quality of life" which has been shown to underlie the koinonia language in the New Testament.<sup>2</sup>

Paul's witness to the koinonia is important not alone because of his more extensive and varied use of the language but for the fact that he was in Hunter's words "the first, and probably the greatest, of the interpreters of the Fact of Christ."<sup>3</sup> It was pointed out earlier that the most determinative factor in any development of the usage of the

---

<sup>1</sup>Twenty-six of the forty-two occurrences are in Paul.

<sup>2</sup>See above, pp. 101 ff.

<sup>3</sup>A. M. Hunter, Interpreting Paul's Gospel (London: SCM Press, 1960), p. 13.



koinonia language in the New Testament was the way in which they interpreted the koinonia reality rather than their view of the language as such.<sup>1</sup> In the previous chapter the koinonia reality was presented in "the pristine vigour of its initial emergence under the impact of Pentecost." While the reflective element was certainly not absent from Luke's description of the character and activities of the first church, yet it was basically description.<sup>2</sup> But with Paul (likewise with the writer to the Hebrews and John) the element of reflection ceases to be quiescent and conservative and becomes creative and constructive.<sup>3</sup> Paul is significant then for present purposes as the first and possibly the foremost interpreter of the koinonia quality of life which was initially viewed in full flower in the Acts of the Apostles.

Paul's employment of koinonia and its cognates points much more specifically than Luke's to the three basic aspects of the koinonia reality. Luke uses koinonia apart from any qualifying construction and its meaning has to be gathered by implication from the larger context. Paul uses the language often very concretely to express the vertical basis of the "sharing-together," its implications for the relation between men thus based and the exclusive character of such a quality of life.<sup>4</sup> It is in line with this threefold bearing of the language in

---

<sup>1</sup>See above, pp. 107-108.

<sup>2</sup>James Hardy Ropes, The Synoptic Gospels (London: Oxford University Press, 1934, 1960), p. 59, stresses the basic historical character of the Lukan writings.

<sup>3</sup>Vincent Taylor, The Atonement in New Testament Teaching (3rd ed., London: The Epworth Press, 1958), p. 54.

<sup>4</sup>See above, pp. 106-107 for a line up of the passages in their respective categories.

Paul that the following discussion will deal in turn with the eschatological entity, the corporate concern and the ethical exclusiveness of what has been termed the koinonia.

The occurrences of the language in the Epistle to the Hebrews and in the Petrine literature will be treated in connection with Paul. A separate consideration of the above is hardly necessary both because of the paucity of the use of the language and because the uses which do occur are similar to the Pauline.

### The Eschatological Entity

The Risen Christ.--The foregoing chapter saw the foundation and content of the koinonia to be the messianic ministry of Jesus who as exalted Lord and Christ was effectively present by the Spirit of the Lord. This same centrality of Jesus for the koinonia is likewise pointed up by Paul in what may be termed his most definitive and comprehensive use of koinonia, I Corinthians 1:9:<sup>1</sup> *πιστὸς ὁ θεός, δι' οὗ ἐκλήθητε εἰς κοινωνίαν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν.* As the object of common participation by the Corinthian Christians Paul had in mind not just the person of the Lord as such, but the total salvation reality resident and manifest in Him.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>The centrality of Christ is indeed strikingly characteristic of all the opening verses: "an apostle of Christ Jesus" (vs. 1), "sanctified in Christ Jesus" (vs. 2), "call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ" (vs. 2), "Grace to you and peace from . . . the Lord Jesus Christ" (vs. 3), "the grace of God . . . given you in Christ Jesus" (vs. 4), "enriched in him" (vs. 5), "the testimony to Christ" (vs. 6), "the revealing of our Lord Jesus Christ" (vs. 7), "the day of our Lord Jesus Christ" (vs. 8) and "the fellowship of his Son" (vs. 9).

<sup>2</sup>See the earlier discussion of I Cor. 1:9, pp. 61-63 above.

As Neugebauer concludes: "Christus ist also verstanden als das, was er getan hat und was mit ihm geschehen ist. . . . Sicher ist Christus eine Person, aber diese Person ist von Paulus als eschatologische Heilstat Gottes interpretiert."<sup>1</sup> This verse and particularly the phrase

κοινωνία τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν gathers up into itself the entire impact of the thanksgiving

(verses 4-8)<sup>2</sup> thus reaching out to comprehend the past, present and future connotations of the salvation which centers in Jesus Christ.<sup>3</sup>

So while this use of koinonia by Paul furnishes the basis for the discussion on the role of the risen Christ in Paul's presentation of the koinonia there is a real sense in which it can comprehend also what has been designated "the Eschatological Entity"; in fact, it encompasses the discussion of the entire chapter. Especially is this evident when it is seen in context as the transition between Paul's introductory statements (vss. 1-9) and the body of the letter which concerns itself with the concrete problems of the Christian community at Corinth.

The centrality of Jesus Christ in the salvation purposes of God implicit in I Corinthians 1:9 is established for Paul by the resurrection. To the church at Rome he wrote of "the gospel concerning his Son, who was . . . designated Son of God in power . . . by his resurrection from

<sup>1</sup>Fritz Neugebauer, In Christus (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1961), p. 55. He supports this point by a reference to Paul's use of koinonia at I Cor. 1:9; 10:16 and Phil. 3:10: "die Beteiligung an dem, was Christus getan hat und was mit ihm geschehen ist."

<sup>2</sup>Seesemann, p. 49. Also there is no reason to exclude the significant affirmations of the salutation (vss. 1-3) from the reference of this phrase.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. C. A. A. Scott, Christianity According to St. Paul, pp. 16ff., who points out the three tenses in Paul's idea of



the dead, Jesus Christ our Lord" (1:3-4).<sup>1</sup> Here the incarnate Son of God by that event in his history known as the miracle of the resurrection is seen to be instated by God in a position of sovereignty and invested with power, an investiture which surpassed everything that could previously be ascribed to him in his incarnate state.<sup>2</sup> Yet, as James Denney expresses it: "the resurrection only declared Him to be what he truly was"<sup>3</sup> that is, by the resurrection he is clearly defined as the messianic Son of God.<sup>4</sup> This is the Jesus whom Paul views as the content of the gospel which God "promised beforehand through his prophets in the holy scriptures" (Rom. 1:2). The resurrection thus verifies him for Paul as the One in whom the hope integral to the faith of Israel finds its final fulfillment.

The resurrection of Jesus became a fact of Paul's own experience

---

salvation.

<sup>1</sup>Though this passage may reflect a pre-Pauline formula there is no valid reason to see in it anything other than genuine Pauline Christology as, for example, A. M. Hunter, Paul and His Predecessors (New revised ed., London: SCM Press, 1961), p. 26, who sees here an adoptionist Christology as one of the pointers towards its pre-Pauline character. But it seems more probable with Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, p. 292, that when Paul in vs. 3 makes "Son" the subject of the whole two-part confession, he understands that Jesus is the "Son of God" from the beginning. It is highly unlikely that Paul would take over and use without modification a creedal statement which would violate his own understanding of the person of Christ.

<sup>2</sup>John Murray, The Epistle to the Romans, I, The New International Commentary on the New Testament, edited by N. B. Stonehouse (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1959), p. 10.

<sup>3</sup>James Denney, St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, the Expositor's Greek Testament, ed. S. Robertson Nicoll, II (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, n.d.), p. 586. Cf. Murray, p. 5.

<sup>4</sup>For the Messianic significance of this title Cf. Cullmann, Christology of the New Testament, pp. 272ff.

with the appearance of Christ to him on the Damascus road: "Last of all, as to one untimely born, he appeared also to me" (I Cor. 15:8). He equated the appearance of the Lord to him with the appearances of the risen Lord to the others (vss. 5-7).<sup>1</sup> "Am I not an apostle? Have I not seen Jesus our Lord?" (I Cor. 9:1). Both of these statements refer to Paul's conversion experience<sup>2</sup> as the appearance to Paul of a real person.<sup>3</sup> The first assertion (15:8) links Paul's knowledge of the resurrection to the appearance of Christ to him<sup>4</sup> and the second (9:1) places him with the original apostles as a witness of the resurrection of Jesus in virtue of that appearance (cf. Acts 1:21f).<sup>5</sup> Munck has demonstrated that the Old Testament forms which constitute a part of the conversion narratives in Acts "put Paul's experience on the same plane as the experiences that made the great Old Testament figures connecting

---

<sup>1</sup>Paul uses the same word,  $\omega\phi\theta\eta$  of both appearances indicating that he regarded them as the same in kind. Archibald Robertson and Alfred Plummer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1911), p. 340. Cf. the more extended discussion in John Knox, Chapters in a Life of Paul (New York: Abingdon Cokesbury, 1950), pp. 121-122.

<sup>2</sup>Robertson and Plummer, pp. 177-340. Gal. 1:16, God "was pleased to reveal his Son to (in) me" may also refer to the Damascus experience. Cf. Johannes Munck, Paul and the Salvation of Mankind, tran. Frank Clarke, (London: SCM Press, 1959), p. 34.

<sup>3</sup>J. Gresham Machen, The Origin of Paul's Religion, (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1928), pp. 67-68. Munck emphasizes that "when Paul mentions the experience, he simply says that he saw Christ, without going into it in more detail."

<sup>4</sup>Donald Joseph Selby, Toward an Understanding of Paul (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1962), p. 167.

<sup>5</sup>Leon Morris, The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, The Tyndale New Testament Commentaries, ed. R. B. G. Tasker, (London: The Tyndale Press, 1958), p. 131.

links in God's plan of salvation.<sup>1</sup> Thus as H. G. Wood sums it up, the appearance on the Damascus road "meant first and foremost the conviction, or one might say, the revelation, that Jesus has been raised from the dead and is seated on the right hand of power. Henceforth, for Paul, Jesus is Christ and Lord."<sup>2</sup> Menoud rightly stresses that Paul's conversion can be classed as theological, for in it came a new revelation of the God of Israel as shown in the act of God in Christ. The result was a reorganization of his Jewish messianic faith and hope. In this reorganization Paul perceived among other things the unity of the divine work in the Old and New Covenant.<sup>3</sup>

In I Corinthians 15:3-11 the Christ event is presented by Paul as the fulfillment of the messianic promises both for him and the early church.<sup>4</sup> The final conviction of this for Paul as has been pointed out lay in the appearance of Christ to him which he here puts on a level with the post-resurrection appearances to the others. This passage makes plain, however, that an important element in Paul's view of the risen Jesus as Lord and Christ was the tradition handed down by those who were Christians before him: "For I delivered to you as of first importance what I also received. . . ." (15:3).<sup>5</sup> Paul was neither ignorant of the

<sup>1</sup>Munck, p. 33.

<sup>2</sup>H. G. Wood, "The Conversion of St. Paul: Its Nature, Antecedents and Consequences," New Testament Studies, I (1955), 281.

<sup>3</sup>Philippe H. Menoud, "Revelation and Tradition, the Influence of Paul's Conversion on His Theology," Interpretation, 7 (1953), pp. 131, 134. The other two points at which Menoud sees the dependence of Paul's theology upon his conversion is the redemptive value of the cross and what he calls the two states in salvation.

<sup>4</sup>Wendland, p. 121.

<sup>5</sup>Cf. A. M. Hunter, Paul and His Predecessors, pp. 15-18, 117-



proclamation of Jesus as Lord and Christ before his conversion<sup>1</sup> nor did he isolate his experience from their tradition, but conceived of himself as a part of it: "Last of all . . . he appeared also to me" (15:8). It was his personal encounter with the risen Christ on the Damascus road which convinced him of the truth of the claim of those first Christians whom he had so violently persecuted.<sup>2</sup> The risen Christ for Paul from that time on was central in the salvation activity of God among his people. He wrote that Christ ἀπέθαρεν, ἐτάφη and ὤφθη (all aorists), but that he ἐξηγέρται (perfect tense)--Christ is alive now!<sup>3</sup>

The risen and living Christ as continually constitutive of the koinonia is inherent in the focal passage of this phase of the discussion, I Corinthians 1:9. The κοινωρία τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ has a present perspective for Paul--an "erworbene reale Anteilnahme an dem himmlischen Herrn und seinem Heil in der Gegenwart" according to Kümmler.<sup>4</sup> The Corinthians along with Paul "are called into (ἐκλήθητε) a koinonia of his Son Jesus Christ" which comprehends all previous affirmations. They have been "sanctified (ἁγιασμένοις)"<sup>5</sup>

---

118, for a recent consideration of I Cor. 15:3ff. as pre-Pauline paradosis.

<sup>1</sup>Machen, p. 67.

<sup>2</sup>James S. Stewart, A Man in Christ (New York: Harper Brothers, n.d.), p. 134.

<sup>3</sup>Stewart, p. 137, stresses this point quoting R. H. Strachan, The Historic Jesus in the New Testament, p. 46; "the perfect ἐξηγέρται reverberates like the stroke of a bell through the chapter."

<sup>4</sup>Lietzmann, p. 167.

<sup>5</sup>"A condition which has been called into being and consequently

in Christ Jesus" (vs. 2), "the grace of God . . . was given (δοθείση )" them "in Christ Jesus" (vs. 4); they "were enriched in him (ἐπλουτίσθητε )" (vs. 5); to them "the testimony to Christ was confirmed. (ἐβεβαιώθη )" (vs. 6) and they "are not lacking (ὕστερεῖσθαι ) in any spiritual gift" as they "wait (ἀπεχδεχόμενοι ) for the revealing of our Lord Jesus Christ" (vs. 7) "who will sustain (βεβαιώσει) . . . (them) to the end" (vs. 8). They are together partaking in a salvation reality which centers in the person of the risen Christ. This meaning of Christ evident in these opening verses and so aptly indicated by the use of koinonia in verse nine is "a shared meaning,"<sup>1</sup> one which binds them uniquely together.

Three times (vss. 2, 4, 5) in these verses Paul has employed his characteristic expression ἐν Χριστῷ<sup>2</sup> in which more than in any other he has captured the centrality of the risen and living Christ for the continual realization of the saving activity of God.<sup>3</sup> As is indicated in 1:4, "the grace of God which was given you in Christ Jesus," to "be in Christ" is to be taken up into the sphere of God's redemptive activity:<sup>4</sup> "ἐξ αὐτοῦ δὲ ὑμεῖς ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ whom

exists." F. W. Grosheide, Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians, The New International Commentary on the New Testament, ed. N. B. Stonehouse (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1953), p. 23.

<sup>1</sup>John Knox, Chapters in a Life of Paul, p. 112.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Deissmann, Die neutestamentliche Formel "in Christo Jesu," Marburg: Elwert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1894, and more recently Walter Bartling, "The New Creation in Christ," Concordia Theological Monthly, XXI (June 1950), pp. 26-418.

<sup>3</sup>A. M. Hunter, Interpreting Paul's Gospel, p. 37ff.

<sup>4</sup>Bartling, p. 403.

God made our wisdom, our righteousness and sanctification and redemption" (I Cor. 1:30; cf. Rom. 8:1; 6:11; Gal. 3:26; II Cor. 5:21; Phil. 3:9). For Paul it is "in Christ," in his person and his work, as once historical and yet living that God is executing his saving purposes.<sup>1</sup> Such a being "in Christ" according to Romans 6:1-12 results from the dying and rising with Christ implicit in the act of baptism thus signifying a realistic identification with the person of Christ both crucified and risen.<sup>2</sup> Ernst Percy concludes that

das Sein des Gläubigen in Christus bei Paulus reales Teilhaben an allem, was Christus als Heilsmittler der Menschen gelitten und gewirkt hat, bedeutet und dass dies reale Teilhaben dadurch bewirkt wird, dass der Gläubige auf eine ganz reale Weise in Christus selbst als jene geschichtliche Person, die am Kreuze starb und am dritten Tage auferweckt wurde, eingegliedert wird.<sup>3</sup>

Paul by the phrase  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$ <sup>4</sup> most vividly portrays his conviction

<sup>1</sup>The  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  is to be taken in most cases as local. Cf. Best, pp. 1, 5, 19, 21; Ernst Percy, Der Leib Christi ( $\Sigma\ \omega\mu\alpha\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$ ) in den paulinischen Homologumena und Antilegomena (Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1942), p. 22.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., pp. 404-407. C. H. Dodd, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, the Moffatt New Testament Commentary (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1932), p. 86 brings the concept of corporate personality to bear on the understanding of Romans 6:1-14: "In order to understand the argument here, we must bear in mind the teaching of the last chapter, that Christ is the inclusive Representative of the people of God, or redeemed humanity, which constitutes in union with Him a sort of corporate personality 'in Adam,' its inclusive representative. That which Christ did and suffered on behalf of mankind is the experience of the people of God concentrated in Him."

<sup>3</sup>Percy, p. 38. As Best, p. 21, indicates however this is only one of the "two fundamental ideas in the formula; believers are 'in Christ'; the place of salvation is Jesus Christ (or salvation is 'in Christ'); these two fundamental ideas are linked through the conception of Christ as in some way a corporate personality."

<sup>4</sup>Neugebauer, p. 92, sets the salvation  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$  in direct contrast to the salvation  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \nu\omicron\lambda\omicron\mu\omega\varsigma$  "Paulus hat eben nicht nur in Antithesen geredet, ging es ihm doch auch weniger um den



that it was in intimate personal relationship to the risen Christ that the salvation of God is to be continually experienced.

To be thus "in Christ" was for Paul a social as well as an individual concept:<sup>1</sup> it was the Church of God which was "sanctified in Christ Jesus" (I Cor. 1:2) for it was their participation in the salvation reality of God resident in the risen Christ which constituted them the Christian community. To be "in Christ" was a κοινωρία τοῦ Χριστοῦ a sharing-together "in Christ." Those who were in such a relationship to the risen Christ were conceived of as being a new creation: "if any one is in Christ, he is a new creation" (II Cor. 5:17). Paul, due perhaps to the fact that it was the risen Christ whom he first knew, interpreted Christ in virtue of the resurrection as the second Adam (Rom. 5:12ff; I Cor. 15:45) and the head of a new humanity, a new creation of which he himself was the ἀνταρχή (I Cor. 15:20,23) and the πρωτότοκος (Rom. 8:29; Col. 1:18).<sup>2</sup> Christ was not only the first member but was Himself the "life-giving spirit" (I Cor. 15:45) of the new creation. This new creation had its being and reality "in Christ," so much so that Christ was considered to be its inclusive personality: "To be in Christ is to be in the new creation which Christ represents."<sup>3</sup>

Gegensatz, sondern darum, dass das eschatologische Heil in Christo Jesu geschehen ist, geschieht und geschehen wird."

<sup>1</sup>Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 86.

<sup>2</sup>D. M. Stanley, "The Theme of the Servant of Jahweh in Primitive Christian Soteriology, and its Transposition by Saint Paul," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 16 (1954) p. 419f. He considers this presentation of Christ as head of a new creation as "Paul's chief contribution to Apostolic Christianity." He locates the source of the theme in Is. 43:18-19. Cf. the discussion by Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, pp. 36-37.

<sup>3</sup>Bartling, p. 412.

Paul has utilized here the Hebrew idea of corporate personality by which a community can be thought of in terms of its representative head.<sup>1</sup> As Bartling further expresses it: "To belong to the community is to be in Christ; to be in Christ is to belong to the community."<sup>2</sup> The important fact at this stage of the discussion is that in the characteristically Pauline phrase  $\epsilon\upsilon\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omega$  the risen Christ is seen to be realistically and intimately bound up with the new humanity as its constitutive and representative head. And in the risen Christ as such is found the unity of the community: "you are all one in Christ Jesus" (Gal. 3:27).

Paul's use of the similar phrase  $\sigma\upsilon\nu\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omega$  is likewise significant for the relation of the Christian to Christ. It is distinct from  $\epsilon\upsilon\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omega$  in that it is employed in a more specialized manner. For according to Ernst Lohmeyer:

Tod, Auferstehung und Vollendung sind also die Momente, die den Sinn der Gemeinschaft 'mit Christus' bestimmen. . . . Niemals wird die Gegenwart des tätigen oder duldenden frommen Lebens unmittelbar von dem Sinne des 'mit Christus' berührt. Dieser noch der irdischen Zeit angehörige Bezirk ist durch eine Christusgemeinschaft erfüllt, die wohl durch 'in Christus' oder 'durch Christus' oder 'zu Christus' wiederzugeben ist; es ist die Sphäre des Glaubens und der Tat.<sup>3</sup>

As with "in Christ" one can perhaps with Best<sup>4</sup> find the solution of "with Christ" in the concept of corporate personality. The stress, however, is not social, but upon the solidarity of the individual with Christ in

<sup>1</sup>Best, cf. n. 2, p. 263.

<sup>2</sup>Bartling, pp. 412f.

<sup>3</sup>Ernst Lohmeyer, " $\Sigma\upsilon\nu\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omega$ ," Festgabe für Adolf Deissmann (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr Paul Siebeck, 1927), pp. 31f.

<sup>4</sup>Best, pp. 56f.

the latter's death, resurrection and parousia. The approach is more individualistic. The emphasis is on the relationship of each believer to Christ rather than on the relationship of each to the others.<sup>1</sup> The meaning of this phrase is neither identical with nor included in the somewhat broader "in Christ." Each expresses different, yet not wholly unrelated, aspects of the relationship between Christ and believers.

The risen Christ in whom the koinonia centers Paul also confesses as Lord (I Cor. 1:9). He took over this confession of Jesus as Lord (*κύριος Ἰησοῦς*) from the earliest church which expressed its whole faith with the single word *κύριος*.<sup>2</sup> There the title designated the present Lordship of Christ as established by the resurrection in fulfilment of Psalms 110:1 (Acts 2:33-37). As is evident from Romans 10:9 and Philippians 2:9-11 Paul employed the title "Lord" in essentially the same way only developing further its implications. The latter reference indicates that involved is the whole Lordship of God, not only making Jesus equal with, but also identifying him with God.<sup>3</sup> As Cullmann summed it up in an earlier work, "if Christ is Lord today, this is because yesterday He became flesh and was crucified, and because tomorrow He will come again to judge the quick and the dead."<sup>4</sup> More recently he has concluded:

This title rests upon faith in two essential elements of Heils-

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 59.

<sup>2</sup>Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, p. 216.

<sup>3</sup>Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, pp. 217-218. Cf. pp. 203-232, for a full discussion of the use of the title by the early church and Paul.

<sup>4</sup>Oscar Cullmann, The Earliest Christian Confessions (London: Lutterworth Press, 1949), p. 64.



geschichte: (1) Jesus is risen: (2) the fact that the decisive event of the resurrection has already happened but that the eschatological fulfilment has not yet happened does not mean that Heilsgeschichte has been interrupted.<sup>1</sup>

But as was stressed in a previous chapter<sup>2</sup> when Paul confesses Jesus as Lord thus seeing in the risen exalted Christ the culmination of the salvation purposes of God, he does not view him in separation from the apostolic tradition of the historical Jesus. Rather, the exalted Lord Jesus as the real author of that tradition is present in that tradition for he stands behind it and works in it.<sup>3</sup> The risen Christ as the continuing object of "the sharing-together quality of life" is brought by Paul into sharp focus as he designates him Lord. By the title "Lord" Paul views in heilgeschichtliche perspective the historical Jesus whom God has highly exalted and given "the name which is above every name" (Phil. 2:9) as the object in the present of "the sharing-together quality of life."

The future connotation of *κοινωνία τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* implicit in the title "Lord" is explicit in I Corinthians 1:9. In the verses which precede, Paul, heaping up the present riches of the Corinthians "in Christ," writes to them: "you are not lacking in any spiritual gift, as you wait for the revealing of our Lord Jesus Christ; who will sustain you to the end, guiltless in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ" (vss. 7-8). Then he adds, "God is faithful, by whom you were called"<sup>4</sup> εἰς

<sup>1</sup>Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, p. 233.

<sup>2</sup>See above, pp. 186-187.

<sup>3</sup>Cullmann, "The Tradition," The Early Church, p. 68.

<sup>4</sup>Seesemann, p. 50, sees both the future and the present, both ἐν Χριστῷ εἶναι and διὰ Χριστοῦ εἶναι to be comprehended by I Cor. 1:9 in view of the use of κατεῖχε.

κοινωνίαν of his Son, Jesus Christ our Lord." The faithfulness of God is their ultimate ground of confidence<sup>1</sup> in the final day of God (Rom. 2:5), now known as "the day of our Lord Jesus Christ," (cf. I Th. 4:15ff.) for with the full revelation of Jesus Christ comes the complete consummation of the salvation purposes of God.<sup>2</sup> This faithfulness of God by which they will be able to stand guiltless in the day of Jesus Christ is guaranteed to them in the fact that they are already sharing experientially in Jesus Christ, and in God's salvation resident in him. The word κοινωνία in verse nine is the clue to the understanding of the word ἀνεκλήτους in verse eight.<sup>3</sup> As was evident in Paul's confessing of Jesus Christ as Lord, present participation in the risen Christ carries with it the assurance of future consummation: the secret of being "with Christ"<sup>4</sup> is bound up with being "in Christ."<sup>5</sup> The whole salvation of God is wrapped up in his person.<sup>6</sup> What God has begun now in Christ, he will finish in Christ (I Cor. 15:22; Phil. 1:6). His

---

<sup>1</sup>Robertson and Plummer, p. 8.

<sup>2</sup>Adolph Schlatter, Paulus, Der Bote Jesu, Eine Deutung Seiner Briefe an die Korinther (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1956), p. 65. "Die alte prophetische Formel 'Tag Gottes' dient auch Paulus zur Beschreibung des Kommenden, nun in der Form, dass der Tag Gottes bestimmter als der Tag des Christus gekennzeichnet ist."

<sup>3</sup>Grosheide, p. 32.

<sup>4</sup>Rom. 6:8; II Cor. 4:14; 13:4; Phil. 1:23; Col. 2:13, 3:3, 4. Cf. Lohmeyer, "Σὺν Χριστῷ," pp. 248-257, for a discussion of the significance of the phrase σὺν Χριστῷ in this connection. See above, p. 265.

<sup>5</sup>Hunter, Interpreting Paul's Gospel, p. 53. For a concise presentation of the content of the Christian hope for Paul, cf. pp. 50-55.

<sup>6</sup>Cf. Eph. 2:5-7 and Col. 2:12-13 where the two perspectives appear to merge into one. Lohmeyer, "Σὺν Χριστῷ,"

purpose now and then is ever *κοινωνία τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*.<sup>1</sup> This is the comprehensive outreach of the phrase for Paul.

The foregoing perspective of *κοινωνία Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* has an interesting parallel in I Peter 5:1 where Peter writes of his being "a partaker (*κοινωνός*) in the glory that is to be revealed."<sup>2</sup> Here Peter describes himself as presently sharing in that which is to be fully manifested in the future. Here is that combination of present and future found in the person of the risen Christ which is common to the New Testament and particularly finds expression in Paul.<sup>3</sup> Peter's reference may be more specifically to the special privilege granted to him when he saw the transfiguration of Jesus which can be regarded as a preview of the glory of Christ as it will be manifested at the parousia.<sup>4</sup>

The eschatological essence of "the sharing-together quality of life" is first and fundamentally for Paul the person of the risen Christ in whom God has centered and will bring to final consummation his redemptive purpose for all creation. Jesus Christ as Lord and God's final salvation activity are so identified by Paul that he can sum up God's total salvation benefit as *κοινωνία τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ*

---

pp. 253-255.

<sup>1</sup>Wendland, p. 13.

<sup>2</sup>See above, pp. 92f.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. II Cor. 5:5; Eph. 1:11-14; 2:5-7.

<sup>4</sup>Alan M. Stibbs, The First Epistle General of Peter, The Tyndale New Testament Commentaries, ed. R. V. G. Tasker (London: The Tyndale Press, 1959), p. 167. Selwyn, p. 229. This interpretation assumes the apostolic authorship of I Peter which Stibbs and Selwyn accept, but cf. F. W. Beare pp. 24-31, who rejects the Petrine authorship.



Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν. When men are in right relationship to Jesus Christ the past and the future salvation activity of God in him is made real in their present experience. All this Paul attempts to point up in a comprehensive way by κοινωρία Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ thus encompassing both the person and the full heilsgeschichtliche significance of Jesus Christ.

The Spirit of Christ.--the participation of the believer in the salvation reality of God now centered in the person of the risen Christ, can also be described by Paul as a "sharing-together" in the Holy Spirit. In Philippians 2:1 the starting point of the apostle's appeal for Christian unity is the gift of the Holy Spirit and the believer's conscious experience of his indwelling and activity<sup>1</sup>: "So if there is any . . . participation in the Spirit (κοινωρία πνεύματος) . . . complete my joy . . . ." Similar at this point is the usage in the rich benediction of II Corinthians 13:13: "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God and the fellowship (RSV margin, "participation in") of the Holy Spirit (κοινωρία τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος) be with you all." Here Paul in a comprehensive, theologically pregnant, three-in-one expression indicates his desire that the full salvation blessing of God be with the Corinthian church. By the last of the three phrases the apostle expresses in another way the identical salvation-reality resident in each of the former phrases. That which Paul knew as "the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God" respectively

<sup>1</sup>Ralph P. Martin, The Epistle of Paul to the Philippians, The Tyndale New Testament Commentaries, ed. R. V. C. Tasker (London: The Tyndale Press, 1959) p. 91. Cf. the discussion on the precise force of koinonia in the verse, above pp. 63 ff.

he also learned to know as "the participation in the Holy Spirit."<sup>1</sup> This "participation in the Holy Spirit" in which the Holy Spirit is involved as both the gift and the giver<sup>2</sup> lay at the heart of any experimental realization of the saving activity of God which was bound up with the risen Christ. And as these verses imply, it was integral also to the being of the Christian community. So for Paul, to be "in Christ" was in some sense also to be "in the Spirit" (cf. I Cor. 1:2 and Rom. 14:17.)<sup>3</sup> The two phrases, however, are not identical, for the emphasis of the latter is on the inner experience, while the former has more to do with the objective reality of redemption.<sup>4</sup>

The apostle's view of the link between the Holy Spirit and Christ is in continuity with that which was demonstrated earlier. In the Synoptic Gospels Jesus is the bearer of the eschatological Spirit of God.<sup>5</sup> After Pentecost, in the book of Acts, the Holy Spirit continues the ministry and mission of Jesus through the men of the early church. These men's experience of the Holy Spirit was vitally related to their experience of Jesus, so much so, that the former became for them the effective presence of Jesus as both Lord and Christ.<sup>6</sup>

A passage which sets the stage for the more specific pronounce-

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. above, pp. 66f.

<sup>2</sup>Wendland, p. 234.

<sup>3</sup>Hunter, Interpreting Paul's Gospel, p. 39.

<sup>4</sup>Percy, p. 35. Best, p. 12, notes that "the distinction between the two emerges in the fact that 'in the Spirit' has as its opposite 'in the flesh', whereas the true opposite of 'in Christ' is 'in the law.'"

<sup>5</sup>See above, p. 183.

<sup>6</sup>See above, pp. 223, 227.

ments of Paul concerning Christ and the Holy Spirit and in which the link between the apostle and the early church is clearly evident is Romans 1:4 where he makes use of a traditional formula. Here Jesus Christ confessed by Paul as Lord is "designated Son of God in power according to the Spirit of holiness (κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης) by his resurrection from the dead." The Holy Spirit becomes with the resurrection and exaltation the vehicle and the mode of his status as Lord: κατὰ σὰρκα (vs. 4) stands in contrast to κατὰ πνεῦμα. α. As the flesh was his manner of life while on earth in the same way the Spirit is his manner of life after the resurrection of Christ (cf. I Cor. 6:14, 15:45; Rom. 6:4, 8:1).<sup>1</sup>

The Spirit as the life of the exalted Lord accounts for the essential relationship between Christ and the Spirit in respect to the believer. In II Corinthians 3:17 Paul makes the striking assertion ὁ δὲ κύριος τὸ πνεῦμα ἐστίν indicating that "the Spirit so effectively performs His office of communicating to men the benefits of the risen Christ that for all intents and purposes of faith the Lord himself is present bestowing grace on His own."<sup>2</sup> The identity is a dynamic one of redemptive action. Even the realization of the present Lordship of Christ is dependent upon the action of the Spirit. "No one can say 'Jesus is Lord' except by the Holy Spirit" (I Cor. 12:3). Paul further expresses this relationship in Romans 8:9-10 as he describes the

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Hamilton, pp. 12-15 for a discussion of the manner in which these verses support this assertion.

<sup>2</sup>Hamilton, p. 6. For other interpretations of this passage cf. Jean Héring, La Seconde Epître de Saint Paul, Vol. VIII of Commentaire du Nouveau Testament (Neuchâtel: Delachaux and Niestle, 1958), p. 39.

aux  
Corinthiens



same phenomenon as first "you are in the Spirit" and then as "Christ is in you." Between the two he emphatically affirms that "anyone who does not have the Spirit of Christ does not belong to him". In every respect the Spirit is the connecting link between Christ and the believer: to have the Spirit is to belong to Christ and to be Christ's is to possess the Spirit of God. Thus it is that the Spirit is the Spirit of Christ. As Wendland expresses it:

Das Pneuma ist der Geist Christi und damit zugleich die Gegenwart des Heils und des Lebens, das Christus schenkt, so wie Christus selber gibt, was er ist, und ist in dem, das er gibt. Die innenweltliche Entgegensetzung von Ding und Person, Objekt und Subject ist in der Christlichen Pneumalehre unbrauchbar.<sup>1</sup>

This identity<sup>2</sup> of the Lord and the Spirit from the standpoint of faith is ultimately rooted in the fact that the Spirit as the life of the resurrected and exalted Lord is likewise the channel of the Lord's life in his redemptive action. Thus it is in the life of Christ himself that the believer shares through the Holy Spirit.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Heinz-Dietrich Wendland, "Das Wirken des Heiligen Geistes in den Glaubigen nach Paulus," Theologische Literaturzeitung 3 (August, 1952), p. 459.

<sup>2</sup>The identity, however is not absolute for Paul as Alfred Wikenhouser, Pauline Mysticism, tran. Joseph Cunningham (Edinburgh: Nelson, 1960), p. 83, points out: "Paul makes statements about Christ which could not be made about the Spirit. He calls Christ his life in Phil. 1:31, Gal. 2:20, and Col. 3 and 4; but he never says this of the Spirit. In Gal. 4:19 he says that Christ must be formed in him: this is something which he did not and could not say concerning the Holy Spirit. We could not substitute the Holy Spirit for Christ in Rom. 8:29 where he says that Christians must be conformed to the image of the Son of God. Neither can we speak of the Holy Spirit as he does of Christ in Eph. 4:13, where he says that Christians should attain 'the measure of the age of the fullness of Christ.'"

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Markus Barth, pp. 318-361 for an extensive and balanced discussion of the relation of the Holy Spirit to water baptism in Paul.

The eschatological character of Paul's conception of the Holy Spirit is already evident in the way Paul relates the Spirit to the resurrection. It is the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead that dwells in the Christian, now the Spirit of Christ, who will also resurrect the Christian (Rom. 8:11). By their present possession of the promised Holy Spirit they are "sealed (ἐσφραγίσθητε) for the day of redemption" (Eph. 4:30; cf. 1:13). The present activity of the Spirit is the "first fruits (ἀπαρχήν) of the Spirit" (Rom. 8:23) and the "guarantee" (ἀρραβών) or first installment of the Christian's future inheritance of complete redemption (II Cor. 1:22; 5:5; Eph. 1:14), that is, of the full power of the age to come. As such the present participation in the Spirit finds its meaning in the messianic age of promise (Acts 2:16)<sup>1</sup> in which the kingdom purpose of God was to find its fulfilment. While Paul's use of the concept of the kingdom is primarily future (cf. I Cor. 6:9, 10; Gal. 5:21; Eph. 5:5), yet the Spirit as the vital principle of the kingdom (Rom. 14:17) has broken into this "present evil age" (Gal. 1:4) giving with its accompanying assurance a genuine participation in the final salvation act of God. Thus the role of the Spirit in Paul's teaching is similar to that of the Kingdom in the Synoptics,<sup>2</sup> it belongs primarily to the future, yet is a reality in the present. The action of the Spirit in the present and in the future are all of one piece. The believer's share in the future is based on the present indwelling (Rom. 8:11).

The koinonia of the Holy Spirit is both a Christocentric and

---

<sup>1</sup>Wendland, "Das Wirken des Heiligen Geistes in den Glaubigen nach Paulus," pp. 458. See above, pp. 223-225.

<sup>2</sup>Hamilton, pp. 23f.

eschatological reality. When Paul pleads for unity (Phil. 2:1) on the basis of the present dwelling of the Spirit in the lives of the Philippian Christians, he brings to bear the full eschatological meaning of Christ whose person is likewise present in their experience by the Spirit of Christ. It is their new eschatological existence, partaking of the nature of the resurrection and making its realities qualitatively present which ought to motivate them to be what they are. The essence of their relationship to God and His purposes and the resultant life is the Holy Spirit. And when Paul concludes his correspondence to the Corinthian Church by expressing his desire that *ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος* be theirs (II Cor. 13:13), he wishes for them the full salvation benefits of God (cf. Rom. 5:1-5) now centered in the person of the exalted Christ in whom redemption will come to complete realization. This participation in the Spirit is to be common to the whole Church (cf. I Cor. 3:16) and is indeed the foundation of their being such.

The Crucified Christ.--Jesus Christ as the eschatological essence of the koinonia reality (I Cor. 1:9) and shared in through the presence of the Holy Spirit with the believer (Phil. 2:1; II Cor. 13:13; Rom. 8:9) is also for Paul indispensably the crucified Christ. This is particularly evident in I Corinthians 10:16 where he graphically expresses his faith that at the Lord's table Christians in the drinking of the cup and the eating of the bread are partaking of the body and blood of the Lord (*κοινωνία . . . τοῦ αἵματος Χριστοῦ . . . κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ*)--those salvation realities resident in the resurrected, exalted, yet crucified Lord who is



actually present by the Spirit.<sup>1</sup> The cross is so at the heart of Paul's comprehension of the salvation activity of God that he can designate his proclamation of it as "the word of the cross" (I Cor. 1:18). The content of his preaching in his own words is "Christ crucified . . . (which is) to those who are called . . . Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God" (I Cor. 1:23-25).

Paul discovered the salvation-centrality of the cross of Christ through his conversion. His encounter with the exalted Christ convinced him of the truth of the resurrection. This involved an acknowledgment of Jesus as the Son of God compelling Paul to reinterpret the cross,<sup>2</sup> to which a peculiar curse was attached for him (Gal. 3:10). He now saw that the curse was not for Jesus personally, but was one borne vicariously and redemptively for others, freeing them from the curse of sin.<sup>3</sup> The crucifixion and resurrection became for Paul two parts of one divine act for the salvation of mankind.

At the core, both initially and continually, of his relation to God lay an identification with Christ in his death: "I have been crucified with Christ (Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι); it is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me; and the life I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me" (Gal. 2:20). As evidenced in Paul's σὺν-terminology (Rom. 6:8; Col. 2:20; 3:3; Gal. 2:20)<sup>4</sup> his Christian life began in a faith union

<sup>1</sup>See above, pp. 48-54.

<sup>2</sup>Wood, "The Conversion of St. Paul," P. 282.

<sup>3</sup>Menoud, p. 136.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Lohmeyer, "Σὺν Χριστῷ," p. 220: "Sterben mit Christus gehört der Vergangenheit des Gläubigen an, es ist der Beginn

with Christ crucified. The historical deed became a fact of his own experience. The "old self was crucified with him that the sinful body might be destroyed" (Rom. 6:6). Thus following in logical sequence, for the two phases of the one salvation act cannot be separated, is a resurrection with Christ to newness of life<sup>1</sup> (Rom. 6:4-10).<sup>2</sup> This continuing state of life he describes as being "dead to sin and alive to God in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 6:11). At the center of the Christian life, or as Paul loves to put it, being ἐν Χριστῷ stands the exalted and resurrected Christ, who nevertheless remains the crucified Christ: "I am crucified with Christ" (Gal. 2:20).<sup>3</sup>

Singularly expressive of the heart and essence of the Christian faith and life for Paul is the attendance at the table of the Lord. He uses the meaning of that corporate rite both to warn against idolatry (I Cor. 10:14-22) and to rebuke for the lack of genuine unity on the part of the Corinthian Christians (I Cor. 11:17-34). As he interprets the ἐσθίω of the more traditional accounts, Paul sees in I Corinthians 10:16 the significance of the observance as a koinonia of the blood and body of Christ. And as has been pointed out in an earlier chapter these two terms are parallel in their reference to Christ, denoting his

---

seines christlichen Daseins."

<sup>1</sup>This newness of life is also a matter of faith in a future life (vss. 5, 8).

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Pierre Bonnard, "Mourir et vivre avec Jésus-Christ selon saint Paul," Revue d'histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses, 36 (1956), p. 104, who points out that Paul in Romans is not primarily concerned about a doctrine of baptism, but rather is using baptism to illustrate the fact that death with Christ renders impossible "tout retour à une conduite pré-baptismale."

<sup>3</sup>Bartling, p. 403.

sacrificial death viewed from the perspective of its post-resurrection consequences.<sup>1</sup> Thus involved in the partaking of the Lord's Supper is a present redemptive participation in Christ as the Crucified One. What Christ accomplished through his death is here continually realized to be the fountain from which flows the salvation reality of God. The risen Lord with whom the Christians live in an effective redemptive relationship through the presence of the Holy Spirit is always the Christ "who gave himself for our sins to deliver us from the present evil age" (Gal. 1:4). The blood and body of Christ as the object of koinonia lays stress on the death of Christ, and its contemporaneity in the life of the Christian.

In the observance of the Lord's Supper, also, the covenantal perspective of the death of Christ is brought into view. "This cup is the new covenant in my blood" (I Cor. 11:25; cf. Mt. 26:28; Mk. 14:24; Lk. 22:20) is the form of the cup saying in the tradition which Paul possessed. Christ's death, then, the benefits of which the Christian shares, Paul views as the messianic fulfilment of the Sinai covenant (Ex. 24:8) in line with the prophecy of Jeremiah 31:31-34 (cf. Heb. 8:8-12; 10:15-17). In line with this is the further fact that Paschal ideas dominate the whole tradition of the Lord's Supper and that particularly for Paul:<sup>2</sup> "Christ, our paschal lamb, has been sacrificed" (I Cor. 5:7). The significance of Paul's view of the death of Christ as covenantal is first that it is thus placed at the very heart of God's salvation activity, and second, that as such the crucified Christ is

---

<sup>1</sup>See above, pp. 49-54

<sup>2</sup>Higgins, pp. 64ff. See above, p. 57.



constitutive of the new people of God. The laying down of his life as a covenantal sacrifice implies a covenant people.

A further perspective involved in the Lord's Supper in respect to the Christian's faith-relationship with the crucified Christ is brought out by Paul as he follows the words of institution by: "For as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes" (I Cor. 11:26). Certainly implicit in the phrase "proclaim the Lord's death" is that self-communication of the Lord in his death out of which the community continually lives.<sup>1</sup> It is the death of the exalted Lord who now lives which is proclaimed in the eating of the bread and drinking from the cup as the term "Lord" signifies. And to this is added the perspective "until he comes." Thus he who comes to the Lord's table declares not only that Christ died for the sins of the people, but that he lives and that his death is significant for all time,<sup>2</sup> even unto the end. Relevant to the consummation of all things is the death of Christ. The coming Christ is also the Christ who was crucified. Through his approach to the Lord's Supper Paul makes it clear that Christ as the center of the Christian koinonia (I Cor. 1:9) is first, now and always--even in the consummation, the crucified Christ.

The Sufferings of Christ.--Closely related to the previous discussion which spoke of a redemptive participation in the death of Christ mediated by his living presence is what Paul uniquely expresses as the koinonia of Christ's sufferings: τοῦ γινῶναι αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν δούλῃαν τῆς ἀναστάσεως αὐτοῦ καὶ κοινωνίαν

<sup>1</sup>Wendland, Die Briefe an die Korinther, p. 88.

<sup>2</sup>F. W. Grosheide, p. 273.

παθήμεναι αὐτοῦ, συμμορφώμενος τῷ θανάτῳ αὐτοῦ  
 (Phil. 3:10). Here he eagerly desires to participate more fully in what  
 he calls the sufferings of Christ (cf. II Cor. 1:5)<sup>1</sup> looking upon them  
 in some unique sense as the object of the Christian koinonia. Thus a  
 fascinating phase of the eschatological essence in which the "sharing-  
 together" quality of life is rooted is said by Paul to be Christ's  
 sufferings which become a part of Christian life and experience. The  
koinonia is presented in part as a common participation in the suffer-  
 ings of Christ.

Paul's ability to designate his own sufferings and those of his  
 brethren in Christ as the sufferings of Christ (cf. II Cor. 1:5) rises  
 out of the redemptive participation in the death and life of Christ (Rom.  
 6:5) which he finds at the heart of being "in Christ." Involved in the  
 ministry of Jesus which culminates in the cross were the messianic  
 sufferings or tribulations (θλίψις)<sup>2</sup> which Paul links decisively to  
 the life of the Christian in Romans 8:17-18:

"and if children, then heirs, heirs of God and fellow heirs with  
 Christ, provided we suffer with him in order that we may also be  
 glorified with him. I consider that the sufferings of this  
 present time are not worth comparing with the glory that is to  
 be revealed to us."

The latter phrase τὰ παθήματα τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ (cf. I Th. 1:6;  
 II Th. 1:4-7) identified by Paul with the συμπάσχομεν of verse

<sup>1</sup>The RSV interestingly translates "ὅτι καθὼς περισσεύει  
 τὰ παθήματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς ἡμᾶς with "For as we  
 share abundantly in Christ's sufferings." Cf. Arndt and Ging-  
 rich, p. 656.

<sup>2</sup>With the sufferings of Christ the eschatological sufferings of  
 the messianic age began. Cf. Heinrich Schlier, "Θλίβω,  
 θλίψις" Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed.  
 Gerhard Kittel (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1938), III, 140-146.

seventeen relates the sufferings of the Christian with those of Christ.<sup>1</sup> In them they are suffering with him. Their sufferings in some way partake of the nature of his for they are redemptively united with him in both his death and life (Rom. 5:10). Partaking in the *Θλῆψις* of this age, which can be in a sense styled the messianic sufferings, is for Paul an indispensable part of Christian existence. In line with this Luke reports that Paul and Barnabas as they returned through Lystra, Iconium and Antioch were "strengthening the souls of the disciples, exhorting them to continue in the faith, and saying that through many tribulations we must enter the kingdom of God" (Acts 14:22). To the Philippians Paul himself wrote: "For it has been granted to you that for the sake of Christ you should not only believe in him but also suffer for his sake, engaged in the same conflict which you saw and now hear to be mine" (1:29-30).

Particularly in his own life did Paul experience those sufferings which he saw as concomitant with all valid relation to the present activity of God:

"For as the sufferings of Christ abound for us, so also our comfort abounds through Christ (RSV margin). If we are afflicted, it is for your comfort and salvation; and if we are comforted, it is for your comfort, which you experience when you patiently endure the same sufferings that we suffer." (II Cor. 1:5-6).

He looked upon sufferings as integral to Christian service and emphasized them as an essential element of his apostolic ministry.<sup>2</sup> Being in pris-

---

<sup>1</sup>Ahern, p. 18.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. William A. Beardslee, Human Achievement and Divine Vocation in the Message of Paul, Studies in Biblical Theology, no. 31 (Naperville, Illinois; Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1961), p. 114.



on was a part of the grace of his apostleship (Phil. 1:7).<sup>1</sup> Luke traces this understanding of Paul back to the words of the Lord to Ananias concerning him: "Go, for he is a chosen instrument of mine to carry my name before the Gentiles and kings and the sons of Israel; for I will show him how much he must suffer for the sake of my name" (Acts 9:15-16). Paul's own most precise expression of this concept is in Colossians 1:24: "Now I rejoice in my sufferings for your sake, and in my flesh I complete what is lacking in Christ's affliction (  $\tau \omega \rho$   $\Theta \lambda \iota \psi \epsilon \omega \rho \tau \omicron \upsilon \chi \rho \iota \sigma \tau \omicron \upsilon$  ) for the sake of his body, that is, the church."

D. M. Stanley in his evaluation of Paul's use of the Servant theme points out that

the Apostle does not seem to have made any great use of the primary soteriological implications of the Deutero-Isaian prophecy. . . . Paul has, with an astonishing Apostolic liberty, employed his creative genius to elaborate a completely new Servant theology in which he himself appears as the Ebed Yahweh. As a result, this theme hitherto uniquely employed to convey the meaning of the central events of Christ's redemptive mission amongst men, becomes under Paul's inspired pen the basis for his mystical conception of the Christian apostolate.<sup>2</sup>

Stanley mentions that Paul was neither unaware of nor did he neglect entirely in his earlier preaching the Jerusalem church's interest in and use of Christ's redemptive work in terms of the Ebed Yahweh (cf. I Cor. 15:3; Rom. 4:25; Phil. 2:5f.). But he goes on to demonstrate by a series of comparisons of Paul's writings with the Servant songs that Paul, while considering Christ the Servant par excellence, repeatedly reminds his listeners that in his own apostolic labours the work of the

<sup>1</sup>Lohmeyer, Der Brief an die Philipper, pp. 25-26.

<sup>2</sup>D. M. Stanley, "The Theme of the Servant of Yahweh in Primitive Christian Soteriology, and its Transposition by Saint Paul," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 16 (1954), p. 385.

Servant is being carried on (cf. Phil. 2:16 and Is. 49:4; Rom. 10 and Is. 52:7, 53:1). He can call himself the Servant because he is an "ambassador" of the Servant to fulfill his ministry among men (Cf. Is. 52:7 with II Cor. 5:20). Stanley traces Paul's authority for this transposition to his commission from the glorified Christ which was given in terms of the first Servant song (cf. Acts 26:12-18).<sup>1</sup>

Sufferings are for Paul the mark of his apostleship--"the true apostle always carries in his body the death of Jesus"<sup>2</sup> (II Cor. 4:10). That is, in Beardslee's words, "the apostle was the figure in whom the conflict between this age and the age to come was most sharply set forth; as such he could only expect to bear the brunt of the opposition to Christ"<sup>3</sup> (I Cor. 4:9-13; II Cor. 6:3-10). As against his detractors in Corinth who looked for success and pre-eminence as evidence of God's appointment, "Paul takes the depth and persistence of his own difficulties as signs of his special vocation"<sup>4</sup> (II Cor. 1:3-7; 11:21-29). According to Munck Paul is "like Jesus a suffering and dying figure, whose work and power and victory arise from his weakness and infirmity and defeat."<sup>5</sup> When Paul then writes to the Colossians that through his sufferings he is completing in his flesh what is lacking in Christ's afflictions (Col. 1:24), he is viewing his own actual sufferings as a

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 413-418. Beardslee, pp. 112-113, in a similar manner brings out the fact that Paul unites conceptions of witness and suffering which go back to Deutero-Isaiah. Cf. Ahern, p. 6, who goes on to pick up the threads in Qumran Literature.

<sup>2</sup>Munck, p. 184.

<sup>3</sup>Beardslee, p. 88.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 114.

<sup>5</sup>Munck, p. 184.

real participation in the sufferings of Christ. This is because they are endured for Christ's sake and in vital fellowship with him for the Spirit of Christ is the life-principle of Paul's service for Christ.<sup>1</sup> His sufferings are no problem for Paul in that the new age was already in part present. They were eschatological sufferings intimately linked with the conquest of Christ "an incident in a life of achievement."<sup>2</sup> Paul views suffering as essential not only to his apostleship, but also to the gospel itself. That act of God which is the gospel is an act of suffering.<sup>3</sup> It is in the eschatological sense that there is a quota of sufferings which the whole Church, the corporate Christ, must fulfill before God's plan of salvation reaches its consummation. Paul rejoices in taking more than his share of these.<sup>4</sup>

Paul stands not alone but with the whole Christian community in the eschatological situation partaking in what God had done and is doing as the action of God flows from the present living reality of Christ. All this Paul brings to focus in Philippians 3:10 with which this discussion began. Here and in the following verse Paul lifts above all other motives the hope of final union with Christ--the parousia resurrection.<sup>5</sup> Suffering is a part of the excelling way (vs. 10) which leads to

---

<sup>1</sup>C. F. D. Moule, The Sacrifice of Christ (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1956), p. 35. Cf. Ahern, p. 28.

<sup>2</sup>Beardslee, p. 115.

<sup>3</sup>William Baird, Paul's Message and Mission (New York: Abingdon Press, 1960), p. 69.

<sup>4</sup>C. F. D. Moule, The Sacrifice of Christ, p. 34.

<sup>5</sup>Ahern, p. 29. He also points out that this hope "has formed a leitmotif throughout the whole epistle. (Cf. 1:6, 10-11, 23; 3:20-21; 4:5).



that superior end, the resurrection from the dead. (vs. 11). These pathēmata, which allude first perhaps to the total renunciation which the apostle has just described in verses seven to nine,<sup>1</sup> comprehend the life-long state of death inaugurated through the power of the Spirit including concretely the sufferings and tribulations of his life. Thus, by that bond of the resurrection Spirit he can call them truly the sufferings of Christ (παθημάτων αὐτοῦ). And by use here of koinonia, which breathes the spirit of the entire epistle, Paul graciously suggests the part his converts have with him in the vast Θλίψις τοῦ Χριστοῦ (cf. Phil. 1:7, 29) which all Christians must bear to bring the body of Christ to its full measure (Col. 1:24). It is thus that Paul speaks of his sufferings as a koinonia of the immense τὸν παθήματος αὐτοῦ.<sup>2</sup>

At the heart of the sharing in the sufferings of Christ lies the experience of union with Christ in his death and resurrection. For Paul this intimacy of knowledge and experience with his Lord is so close that he can regard his apostolic career as an inner participation in his sufferings.<sup>3</sup> This koinonia of his sufferings which was so vital for Paul is seen to be a reality in all Christian living, for in every life "the glorious Savior claims as his own the sufferings which the dynamic presence of the Spirit occasions in his members."<sup>4</sup> It is in this realistic sense, by the bond of the Spirit of Christ himself, that the

<sup>1</sup>Pierre Bonnard, L'Épître De Saint Paul aux Philippiens, p. 66.

<sup>2</sup>Ahern, p. 29-32. Cf. Best, p. 136.

<sup>3</sup>Ralph Martin, p. 50.

<sup>4</sup>Ahern, p. 50.

821A  
6777

sufferings of Christ are to be viewed as belonging to that eschatological entity from which the koinonia quality of life procures its dynamic.

In I Peter 4:13 κοινωνεῖν is used in a similar context: "rejoice in so far as you share Christ's sufferings (κοινωνεῖτε τοῖς τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθήμασιν ), that you may also rejoice and be glad when his glory is revealed." Peter encourages the Christians in their suffering by identifying them with the sufferings of Christ.<sup>1</sup> They are to rejoice for they have a privileged part in the outworking of God's age-long purpose in line with which Christ entered his glory through suffering (cf. I Pet. 1:10, 11). So to share in Christ's sufferings here is to be assured of future participation in his glory.<sup>2</sup> As in Paul such suffering is connected with the living Christ and the presence of the Holy Spirit (vs. 14). Also he follows the death-resurrection theme that underlies the thought of Paul on Christian suffering. He applies this principle to Christ in 1:11, to himself in 5:1 and to all Christians here in 4:13 and in 5:10.<sup>3</sup> This linking up of the Christian's tribulation with the suffering of Christ is thus very similar to Pauline concepts but appears here in a more primitive or less developed form. The theme need not be unique to Paul, but certainly he saw deeper into it than any other New Testament author.

The Gospel of Christ.--Finally, Paul is able to view the object of the Christian koinonia simply as "the gospel" (I Cor. 9:23; Phil. 1:5-7; cf. Philm. 6). In this context he involves certainly the salvation

<sup>1</sup>See above, pp. 92 f.

<sup>2</sup>Stibbs, p. 159.

<sup>3</sup>Ahern, p. 32.

realities inherent in the gospel, but he reaches out more specifically to include the task of the proclamation of the gospel.<sup>1</sup> The previous discussion has already indicated this aspect, for the sharing of Christ's sufferings comprehended those tribulations which Paul and his fellow Christians endured in the service of Christ. Likewise the phase of "the eschatological entity" is within the scope of that definitive expression of Paul with which the chapter began--"the fellowship (koinonia) of . . . . Jesus Christ" (I Cor. 1:9).

While it is not a direct statement, I Corinthians 9:23 provides an interesting illustration of the above assertion: πάντα δὲ ποιῶ διὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ἵνα συγκοινωνῶς αὐτοῦ γέρωμαι. The first reference of εὐαγγέλιον is most probably defined by the ἵνα clause, that is, the gospel viewed in terms of its salvation blessings (vss. 24-27).<sup>2</sup> The gospel viewed in this sense, then, is the motivation for the πάντα (cf. vss. 1-22) which he undertakes for the furtherance of the gospel (cf. vs. 16)--"that I might by all means save some" (vs. 22). While the partaking is more specifically of the gospel blessings than of the gospel task, the two cannot be separated in this context. As Wendland aptly puts it: "sein eigenes Heil ist unlösbar von seinem apostolischen Amt."<sup>3</sup> Paul is expressing here his participa-

<sup>1</sup>For this general connotation of εὐαγγέλιον cf. Gerhard Friedrich, "εὐαγγέλιον," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. Gerhard Kittel, (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer 1935), II, 726ff.

<sup>2</sup>Clarence Tucker Craig, The First Epistle to the Corinthians, Vol. X, The Interpreter's Bible, ed. Nolan B. Harmon, (New York: Abingdon, 1953), 105. Also Robertson and Plummer, p. 183. But cf. Grosheide, p. 214.

<sup>3</sup>Wendland, Die Briefe an die Korinther, p. 68.



tion in the gospel task, but he views it as an indispensable preliminary to a sharing in the gospel in its fullest sense--the salvation of God.<sup>1</sup> The hope of the latter was determinative of the quality of the former.

A statement more central to Paul's view of the gospel as the object of the Christian koinonia is Philippians 1:5 in which he writes the church at Philippi that he gives thanks to God for τῇ κοινωνίᾳ ὑμῶν εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης ἡμέρας ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν. The passage (vss. 3-11) has to do with Paul's personal relationship with them, as indeed does much of the letter, and τῇ κοινωνίᾳ ὑμῶν εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον states concisely the basic theme of the entire letter. The force of the phrase as set forth in an earlier chapter<sup>2</sup> is that of participation in the work of the gospel, a participation not exclusive of, but based upon their partaking of the gospel itself.

The expression prepares the way for the συγκακοῦνός μου τῆς χάριτος of verse seven which further defines τῇ κ. ὑ. ε. τ. εὐαγγέλιον and thus supports the above interpretation of it. Here the object of participation is grace--"la grace de l'apostolat"<sup>3</sup> (cf. Rom. 1:5; Eph. 3:2). The Philippians are partakers with Paul of his gospel mission among the nations. The immediate reference of the grace is Paul's present imprisonment<sup>4</sup> and it is as συγκακοῦνός with it

<sup>1</sup>In Romans 11:17 there is a similar Pauline use of συγκακοῦνός to express the participation of the Gentiles with the Jews in the messianic salvation of God. See above, pp. 35 f.

<sup>2</sup>See above, pp. 71-74.

<sup>3</sup>Bonnard, L'Épître de Saint Paul aux Philippiens, p. 17.

<sup>4</sup>Paul's "defense and confirmation of the gospel" is believed by most recent writers to describe his trial before the imperial

that they are partakers with Paul in the grace of his God-given commission.<sup>1</sup> And this they have expressed most concretely through their gifts sent by Epaphroditus to Paul, for as Paul put it, they more than any other church ἐκοινωνήσατε εἰς λόγον δόξης καὶ ἀληθείας (4:15). Such realistic sharing with the apostle in grace is a sharing too in the tribulations of that ministry: ἐκοιμήσατε συγκαίνωρῆσά τέ μου τῇ φλίψει (4:14). Their gifts to him in prison were indicative not only of their concern for his needs but also of their participation in the apostolic trials which precede and prepare for the end.<sup>2</sup> Their own actual suffering may well be involved, for to them also ἐχαρίσθη τὸ ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ . . . πάσχειν (1:29).

So in 1:5 when Paul speaks of their participation in the gospel he has in mind their total sharing with him through sympathetic feeling, in like undertakings and by specific personal aid in the gospel mission. Certainly the expression may have been occasioned by the immediate circumstance, but the phrase itself is not to be limited to an offering or offerings, but to their over-all relationship to the apostle in the great task in which they had a part with him.

In the Philippian letter the accent is truly on τῇ κοινωνίᾳ εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. The work of the gospel is central in his relationship to them and perhaps even in a more realistic sense than with any other church as 4:15 would seem to imply. He often makes use

---

court. Martin, p. 63. Cf. Mouton and Milligan, p. 108.

<sup>1</sup>Martin, p. 64.

<sup>2</sup>Bonnard, L'Épître de Saint Paul aux Philippiens, p. 80.

of εὐαγγέλιον in this sense. He speaks of "the defense and confirmation of the gospel" (1:7) in relation to his imprisonment. He is convinced that what has happened to him "has really served to advance the gospel" (1:12). Timothy "as a son with a father" served with Paul "in the gospel" (2:22); others Paul says "have labored side by side with me in the gospel" (4:3). And finally he writes of "the beginnings of the gospel" in Philippi (4:15). Only in 1:27 does Paul speak of the gospel in the more general sense.

In Philemon 6 where the phrase ἡ κοινωνία τῆς πιστεως σου most probably signifies "your partnership in the faith"<sup>1</sup> the work of the gospel may possibly be meant. While it is included, certainly, the first emphasis is more likely to be on Philemon's personal participation in the Christian faith. The import of the entire verse was earlier posited to be "that your partnership in the faith may come to expression in the perception of every good thing among us, and this in and for Christ."<sup>2</sup>

The koinonia reality for Paul centers comprehensively and simply in the person of Jesus Christ. It is ever ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ υἱοῦ Θεοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν (cf. I Cor. 1:9). The final salvation activity of God in Jesus Christ, as risen, yet crucified, and redemptively present in the experience of men by the Holy Spirit, furnishes the raison d'être and personal dynamic of "the sharing-together quality of life" which lies at the heart of the church. And while he speaks of a common partaking in suffering and in the proclamation of the

---

<sup>1</sup>See above, p. 79.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.



gospel, these too are inherently bound up with the person and Spirit of Jesus and with the fulfillment of God's redemptive purposes in him. One phase or another of the eschatologically conceived reality of Jesus Christ is usually the direct, or at least indirect, vertical reference of Paul's use of the koinonia terminology.

Before leaving the eschatological entity of the koinonia reality to consider its horizontal implications in Paul, some parallels in non-Pauline literature should be mentioned. In II Peter, the expression  $\Theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma \kappa\omicron\iota\nu\nu\omicron\iota \Phi\upsilon\acute{\sigma}\epsilon\omega\varsigma$  has an Hellenistic flavor, but nevertheless fits somewhat roughly into the basic import of this section (cf. I Cor. 1:9; II Cor. 13:13; Phil. 2:1). It speaks of a subjective apprehension of the salvation which is in Christ in fulfillment of the promises. The writer to the Hebrews has some interesting uses of  $\mu\epsilon\tau\omicron\chi\omicron\varsigma$  which parallel the present pattern. The stress of  $\mu\epsilon\tau\omicron\chi\omicron\varsigma$  is on the idea of participation without including, as the corresponding koinonia words often do, the idea of community.<sup>1</sup> At Hebrews 2:14 both  $\kappa\omicron\iota\nu\nu\epsilon\acute{\omega}$  and  $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\acute{\chi}\omega$  are used in a parallel way to express different ideas: "Since therefore the children share ( $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\omicron\iota\nu\acute{\omega}\nu\eta\kappa\epsilon\tau$ ) in flesh and blood, he himself likewise partook ( $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\sigma\chi\epsilon\tau$ ) of the same nature . . . ." In the first verb the emphasis is upon the common nature shared by men, while the second expresses the uniqueness of the incarnation.<sup>2</sup> It is in Hebrews 3:14 and 6:4, however, that the similarity to Pauline concepts is obvious. In the first the author and his readers are  $\mu\epsilon\tau\omicron\chi\omicron\iota . . . \tau\omicron\upsilon \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$  In the

<sup>1</sup>Cf. the discussion in Thornton, p. 449ff.

<sup>2</sup>Westcott, The Epistle to the Hebrews, p. 53.

second the author writes of those who have become μετόχους . . . πνεύματος ἁγίου. The references are to a genuine partaking in the eschatological realities of salvation as represented by the person of Christ and the Holy Spirit. Perhaps 3:1 also fits here for he speaks of the brethren, to whom he is writing, as κλησέως ἐπουρανίου μέτοχοι.

### The Corporate Concern

A "sharing-together" in Christ.--It is significant that the participation in Christ so admirably focused in I Corinthians 1:9 is a common participation: κοινωρίαι τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. In fact it is very probable that this perspective forms the rationale for Paul's employment of koinonia in the overall context of I Corinthians. The vertical reference of koinonia has just been investigated and its richness indicated. In I Corinthians 1:9 the phrase κοινωρίαι . . . Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ gathers into itself all the spiritual blessings--past, present and future--which the Corinthians have in Jesus Christ (vss. 1-8). Then by the same phrase, utilizing the horizontal dimension of koinonia as well as the vertical, Paul lays stress on the fact that it is a sharing-"together" in Christ. It is this sharing-"together," the commonness of the salvation blessings of God as centered in the person of Jesus Christ, that Paul lays as a foundation for his treatment of the ethical problems that face him in the Church at Corinth.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Most commentators on this verse are so occupied with the implications of koinonia for the Christian-Christ relationship that they fail to see its significance for the relationship of Christians to one another which is a theme uppermost in the

Since Paul finds the validity of his ethic in the nature of the relation of Christian with Christian by virtue of their common relation to Christ, a preliminary look at the nature of this bond will be taken before it is viewed more realistically in its application to practical issues. In the ultimate sense of course it is the person of Christ himself that unites believer with believer and so all that has been predicated of him must be presupposed in the further definition which is now attempted. In particular is it true of the significance in this regard of koinonia in I Corinthians 1:9. It is a common sharing that is spoken of by the apostle. It is the uniqueness of that which is shared that determines the quality of the sharing<sup>1</sup> rather than any special import of the term itself. So to fathom more precisely what Paul intends by his expression in 1:9 the total context of this key phrase of the epistle is involved. For present purposes this leads to the Pauline concepts of "in Christ" and "the body of Christ."

First in the context is Paul's favorite expression "in Christ"<sup>2</sup> (vss. 2, 4, 5) which is conceptually drawn up into the affirmation of I Corinthians 1:9. And then as Paul develops the first phase of his

---

letter. For example Kümmel in Lietzmann, p. 167 writes only of "die durch den Glauben erworbene reale Anteilnahme an dem himmlischen Herrn und seinem Heil in der Gegenwart." Cf. Wendland, Die Briefe an die Korinther, p. 13; Grosheide, p. 32; Morris, p. 38; George, pp. 175-177. Thornton, pp. 14, 77, does fully recognize this. Cf. Robertson and Plummer, p. 4, who paraphrase "God . . . who Himself called you into fellowship with His Son and in His Son." Also Moffatt, The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, p. 7.

<sup>1</sup> Thornton, p. 77, would say that "we are concerned not simply with a human fellowship and its characteristic embodiments, but also with the divine life imparted to that fellowship." Cf. Martin, p. 46.

<sup>2</sup> See the discussion above pp. 261ff.



argument against divisions in the church to which 1:9 forms the transition, "in Christ" occurs again in a significant manner as he centers the Christian's wisdom "in Christ," which wisdom is *δικαιοσύνη τε καὶ ἁγιασμός καὶ ἀποχύτρωσις* (1:30).<sup>1</sup> While further references are not numerous (3:1; 4:10, 15, 17, 15:18; 19, 22, 31; 16:24) the general significance of the phrase underlies the main argument and is alluded to in *κοινωνία... Χριστοῦ* (1:9). The pertinent question is "what primarily does Paul imply as to the nature of the relation between Christians by his formula 'in Christ'?"

Very little more can be added to what has already been indicated in the earlier treatment of "in Christ." There it was seen as Bartling puts it that "the pregnant *ἐν Χριστῷ* expanded, becomes the 'inclusive' *ἐν Χριστῷ*."<sup>2</sup> That is, while the phrase is emphatically personal, the Christian is not alone "in Christ" for he is brought into a special relationship with other Christians in which he owes certain duties to them which he does not owe to others.<sup>3</sup> A unit is formed of those who are "in Christ"-- in him conceived of as an inclusive or corporate personality.<sup>4</sup> This concept views as one Christ and the new creation (II Cor. 5:17) of which he as the second Adam (Rom. 5:12ff; I Cor. 15:45)<sup>5</sup> is the first member (I Cor. 15:20; 23; Rom. 8:29) and

---

<sup>1</sup>Both the presence of the *τε* and the contrast in the passage between human and divine wisdom would suggest that *σοφία* is further defined by the following three terms. Cf. Robertson and Plummer, p. 27.

<sup>2</sup>Bartling, p. 143.

<sup>3</sup>Best, pp. 20, 2, 4.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., pp. 20ff.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., pp. 34-42.

"life-giving spirit" (I Cor. 15:45).<sup>1</sup> The bond between those of the new humanity is thus a common life, that of Christ himself<sup>2</sup> who is so intimately bound up with the new creation that to be "in it" is to be "in Christ." With Davies, "to be ἐν Χριστῷ is to have discovered the true community."<sup>3</sup>

Also to be "in Christ" is to belong to the "body of Christ."<sup>4</sup> Paul makes reference to that oneness formed by a common relation to Christ, which underlies much of his ethical argument in I Corinthians, as σῶμα Χριστοῦ (I Cor. 12:27; cf. vss. 12-27 and 10:16-17). The relatedness of the two phrases is suggested by Romans 12:5: οἱ πολλοὶ ἐν σῶμα ἔσμεν ἐν Χριστῷ. They are not identical nor can one be taken as explanatory of the other.<sup>5</sup> Rather both have a particular contribution to make to the total picture.<sup>6</sup>

By the phrase σῶμα Χριστοῦ Paul is laying stress on the oneness of the Corinthians as the "body of Christ": ὑμεῖς δὲ ἐστε σῶμα Χριστοῦ καὶ μέλη ἐκ μέρους (12:27).<sup>7</sup> This use

<sup>1</sup>See above pp. 263 ff.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. J. A. T. Robinson, The Body, p. 62.

<sup>3</sup>Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 86.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 178.

<sup>5</sup>Percy, pp. 18, 43ff. makes "in Christ" interpret "body of Christ," while Albert Schweitzer, pp. 122f., seems to follow the opposite procedure.

<sup>6</sup>Best, p. 19.

<sup>7</sup>Neugebauer, p. 97: "In 1 Kor. 12, 12f. aber wird nicht der Leib als Summe der Glieder mit Christus verglichen, sondern die Einheit des Leibes damit, dass Christus Einer ist."

of the body metaphor begins at verse twelve where Paul first refers generally to how "all the members of the body, though many, are one body," and then adds οὕτως καὶ ὁ Χριστός<sup>1</sup> making his reference specific. Christ is one body. Christians are the "body of Christ." The emphatic point is that they are one as the "body of Christ." The accent is on the fact that they are the "body of Christ." In Romans 12:5 the slight difference in expression is due to the accent being there on the unity of the body. But that body is thought of as Christ's body. In both passages, as Percy sums up, "das tragende Moment der Vorstellung dennoch die Einheit der Gläubigen mit Christus selbst ist. Nun dadurch, dass sie als Leib Christi mit Christus selbst eins sind, bilden sie zusammen eine Einheit."<sup>2</sup>

Verse thirteen further enforces the thought that it is as the "body of Christ" that believers are one: καὶ γὰρ ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι ἡμεῖς πάντες εἰς ἓν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν. The ἐν σῶμα is Christ's<sup>3</sup> for the εἰς according to analogy of its usage with "baptize" in Galatians 3:27, Romans 6:3 and I Corinthians 10:2 indicates not result or purpose but "into."<sup>4</sup> It is ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι that they are "baptized" or brought into Christ, a thought that he goes on to stress with a parallel expression adding that Jews, Greeks, slaves and free, πάντες ἐν πνεύμα ἐνοτισθήμεν. Paul's

<sup>1</sup>Markus Barth, p. 338, "Christus ist selbst, so gut wie der natürliche Leib, ein Leib mit vielen Gliedern".

<sup>2</sup>Percy, p. 6.

<sup>3</sup>Kümmel in Lietzmann, p. 187: "εἰς ἓν σῶμα 12 13 nimmt zweifellos das ἐν σῶμα = ὁ Χριστός auf. . . ."

<sup>4</sup>Ibid. Cf. Markus Barth, p. 335; Percy, p. 16.



reference is to the Holy Spirit whose activity incorporates into the "body of Christ." That it is the Holy Spirit who is in view is suggested by its predominance in the preceding passage (vss. 4ff.) and by reference to Mark 1:8 and parallels Acts 1:5; 11:16 and John 1:33 where as here "Spirit" is linked with "baptize."<sup>1</sup> And here as there the stress is most likely not upon water baptism as such, but more upon the Holy Spirit baptism.<sup>2</sup> The emphasis then is upon ἐν πνεύματι of which also they all drank indicating again that it is the common partaking of the Holy Spirit that constitutes them the "body of Christ."<sup>3</sup>

The point of the dual reference to the Holy Spirit in I Corinthians 12:13 is to be found in the fact that the Spirit is the Spirit of Christ.<sup>4</sup> The identity between the two is a dynamic one of redemptive

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. the extended discussion by Markus Barth, pp. 321-337, who paraphrases I Cor. 12:13a by "Wir sind alle mit dem Heiligen Geist auf dem Leib Christi getauft." Percy, p. 16f., however, taking his clue from the lack of the article, sees a parallel to Ephesians 4:4 and sets ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι along side of σὺν as another expression which underlines the theme of the unity of the church despite the diversity of its members. Cf., however, I Cor. 6:17, although even there the thought of the Holy Spirit cannot be entirely absent. Grosheide, p. 150.

<sup>2</sup>Markus Barth, pp. 322f. Grosheide, p. 293, who sees here a reference to baptism proper, is careful to point out that the incorporation does not depend on the administration of baptism, but on the work of the Spirit. Baptism is only valid if there is a working of the Spirit. Paul uses ἐν and not ὅτι because baptism as such is not performed by the Spirit. Morris, p. 174, takes a similar approach stating that the expression "points to the Spirit as the element 'in' which they were baptized. Those baptized are brought within the sphere of the Spirit."

<sup>3</sup>Markus Barth goes on to say that this figure "soll sie wahrscheinlich daran erinnern, dass sie den Geist nicht als Patent der eigenen Vollkommenheit, sondern als Mittel und Kraft zum rechten Wachstum und zur rechten Einheit erhielten." Ibid., p. 326.

<sup>4</sup>See the above discussion, pp. 271ff.

action, an identity rooted in the fact that the Spirit as the life of the resurrected and exalted Lord (Rom. 1:4; 6:4; 8:11; I Cor. 6:14; 15:45; II Cor. 13:4) is likewise the channel of the Lord's life in redemptive action (I Cor. 12:3; II Cor. 3:17).<sup>1</sup> The Holy Spirit brings to subjective reality in the experience of the church that objective redemptive reality resident in the person of Christ in virtue of his crucifixion, resurrection and exaltation which for Paul lies at the heart of his expressive "body of Christ." Thus it is by their participation in the Spirit that they are experientially brought into the "body of Christ."<sup>2</sup> It is by their common experience of the one Spirit that they know that Christ is one, and therefore that they are one for they are the "body of Christ." Their unity is subjectively that of one Spirit, the Spirit of Christ. This is the background of the sense of unity to which Paul appeals in Philippians 2:1 and II Corinthians 13:13<sup>3</sup> when he speaks of a common participation (*κοινωνία*) in the Spirit. To sum up this phase of the import of Paul's expression "body of Christ" for the relation of Christian to Christian the conclusion of Marchant is apt:

The "body of Christ" in the sense of the Church is a metaphor

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Wendland, "Das Wirken des Heiligen Geistes in den Gläubigen nach Paulus," p. 459, quoted above p. 273.

<sup>2</sup>Markus Barth, pp. 350f. He perhaps overdoes the distinction between the objective work of Christ and the subjective action of the Spirit in relation to the believer: "Der Einzelne wird nicht durch den Glauben, den der Geist wirkt . . . zum Leibe Christi. Sondern der Einzelne und die Gemeinde erkennt, glaubt und bezeugt durch die Wirkung des Geistes, dass er kraft der Erwählung Gottes, durch den Gehorsam des Sohnes und wegen der göttlichen Rechtfertigung des Stellvertreters 'in Christus' ist."

<sup>3</sup>This is more fully discussed below pp. 315f.

expressing spiritual experience which is real, unity with Christ and His people which is actual, but not in the actuality of His body glorified with theirs of the flesh, but in the participation and fellowship of the Holy Spirit.<sup>1</sup>

So once again it is a common life, the life of Christ himself, now seen to be shared through the Holy Spirit that lies at the heart of Christian unity.

One final passage is significant for the nature of the bond between Christians in connection with the concept of the "body of Christ." In I Corinthians 10:16-17 there is a distinct continuity evidenced between the body concept and Paul's use of *koinonia*. For this reason its discussion has been delayed until after that concerning I Corinthians 12:12-27 even though the usage of *σῶμα* in 10:16-17 is probably formative of that in the later passages.<sup>2</sup> Paul stresses that the partaking of the elements of the Lord's Supper is a *κοινωνία . . . τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ* and a *κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ* and then follows the latter phrase with *ὅτι εἰς ἅρτος, ἐν σῶμα οἱ πολλοί ἐσμεν*. In verse sixteen the terms *αἷμα* and *σῶμα* are parallel in their reference to the salvation realities resident in the resurrected and exalted, yet crucified Christ who is redemptively present through the Spirit.<sup>3</sup> Verse seventeen, the

<sup>1</sup>Marchant, p. 17. He is taking exception particularly to the view of J. A. T. Robinson, *The Body*, pp. 50-51, who speaks of it as "something not corporate but corporal," adding: "It is almost impossible to exaggerate the materialism and crudity of Paul's doctrine of the Church as literally the resurrection body of Christ."

<sup>2</sup>So also I Cor. 6:15-17. Cf. Shedd, p. 160. This is not necessarily to imply that the source of Paul's employment of "body" in this sense can be fully accounted for by either of these "formative" uses. Cf. Best, pp. 93-95.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. above, p. 54.



vital link in Paul's overall argument,<sup>1</sup> significantly takes the term "body" just used in verse sixteen, and applies it to the Corinthian Christians.<sup>2</sup> They in their common partaking of the one loaf (οὐ γὰρ πάντες ἐκ τοῦ ἑνὸς ἄρτου μετέχομεν ), that is, Christ, are one body--the σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ (cf. 12:27)--ὅτι ἐστὶν ἓν ἄρτος, ἓν σῶμα οἱ πολλοὶ ἐσμεν. The use of "body" in verse sixteen is definitive for its use in verse seventeen. They are "one body" (vs. 17) because they are Christ's body (vs. 16). The terms, while not identical in usage, are identical to the extent that both are Christ's body. Here is further justification for the interpretation of 12:12ff. The Corinthians are the "body of Christ" (12:27) because they partake together (koinonia) of Christ's body as graphically high-lighted in the supreme act of Christian worship, the observance of the Lord's Supper.

The bond between Christians is once more stressed to be that of a sharing-together in that which is one--Christ himself as the fountain of the salvation of God, the common life of believers. This passage shows that by the concept of the "body of Christ" Paul is not viewing the church as an instrument in which Christ dwells like a personality in a body, but the metaphor is one of unity and mutuality. The look is inward and not outward. It is a theme of internal structure, the common relation of Christians to Christ.<sup>3</sup> The unity is in Christ: "you are

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. above, pp. 65-67. Best, p. 88, for example, takes vs. 17 as a digression in Paul's argument. So also Grosheide, p. 234.

<sup>2</sup>This is the reason he shifts the traditional order of the elements in this passage.

<sup>3</sup>Marchant, p. 13.

all one in Christ" (Gal. 3:28).<sup>1</sup>

The connection of the "body of Christ" with the rite of the Lord's Supper suggests the covenantal perspective. Paul certainly viewed the Lord's Supper as covenantal (I Cor. 11:25)<sup>2</sup> in the context of the Passover.<sup>3</sup> The Lord's Supper as the high moment of Christian worship was the fulfilment in Christ of the Passover--the high moment of Jewish worship. It was this feast which expressed most intensively the oneness of Israel as the people of God. And in this consciousness of unity, though a social consciousness expressed as corporate personality or racial solidarity played a significant role, the dominating factor was that of the covenant.<sup>4</sup> This covenantal consciousness is carried over and intensified in the Lord's Supper where Christ is viewed by Paul as the constitutor of a new covenant in his blood.<sup>5</sup> The old covenant is fulfilled in Christ. The new covenant unity by which the new people of God is constituted<sup>6</sup> is "in Christ."<sup>7</sup> Paul needed some

---

<sup>1</sup>The entire passage reads: "For as many of you as were baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus." (Gal. 3:27-28).

<sup>2</sup>Wendland, Die Briefe an die Korinther, p. 89.

<sup>3</sup>Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, 250f. This would be reinforced if 10:18 refers to the Jewish Passover. Cf. Moffatt, The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, p. 136.

<sup>4</sup>Marchant, p. 14. See above, pp. 122-129.

<sup>5</sup>Behm, "αἶμα," pp. 173-175. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, pp. 352-353.

<sup>6</sup>Shedd, p. 191.

<sup>7</sup>Marchant, p. 16: "The great Pauline phrases 'in Christ' and 'with Christ' have covenantal undertones, both as regards their sacrificial connotations and also, as a result, their communal associations."

vivid picture to get this across to the Gentile reader unused to covenantal concepts. As Marchant phrases it:

The term "body" was there to hand: not only was it "in the air" but in fact it linked up with the thought of the offering of Christ's body on the cross, to the event with which in baptism each Christian had been taught to identify himself by faith. In the Holy Communion it could easily arise as a theme linked with the words of institution in which the new covenant finds explicit expression in the Pauline tradition, and it simply remained to apply the word as a term for the Church.<sup>1</sup>

So from whatever angle the attempt is made carefully to define the nature of the bond between Christians implicit in the koinonia τοῦ Χριστοῦ Pauline phraseology and concepts lead relentlessly to the person of Jesus Christ. No more precise definition can be made of the unity between Christians than Christ himself. Markus Barth expresses this well in relation to the "body of Christ":

So ist Jesus Christus der Grund und die Gewähr, der Indikativ und der Imperativ, die massgebende Vergangenheit, Gegenwart und Zukunft für die glaubens--und lebensmässige Einheit der Gemeinde mit ihm und für die Einheit der Gemeindeglieder untereinander.<sup>2</sup>

But perhaps Paul himself best sums it up as he writes to the Colossians of "Christ who is our life" (3:4). The life that Christians share and which constitutes their unity is that of Christ himself.

This "life of Christ," however, in which is found the essence of Christian unity Paul can apply ethically as agapē.<sup>3</sup> Christ is the manifestation of the love of God (Rom. 5:8). And "the love of God in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 8:39) is likewise "the love of Christ" (Rom. 8:35). The

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 17.

<sup>2</sup>Markus Barth, p. 348.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. the discussion of this word in Paul by Stauffer in Quell and Stauffer, pp. 54ff.



presence of Christ is the presence of love. The life which the Christians share is above all one of love, of divine agapē. So love, according to Paul, is the prime characteristic of inter-Christian relationships:

For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision nor uncircumcision is of any avail, but faith working through love (δι' ἀγάπης). . . . Through love (διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης) be servants of one another. For the whole law is fulfilled in one word, "You shall love your neighbor as yourself."<sup>1</sup>

Paul ascribes the actual working of love in the believer to the Holy Spirit. In the same Galatian passage he goes on to exhort: "walk by the Spirit. . . . the fruit of the Spirit is love" (Gal. 5:16, 22). In Romans 5:5 Paul flatly declares that "God's love (ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ) has been poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit which has been given us."<sup>2</sup> Thus he can later in the same letter appeal "by (διὰ) our Lord Jesus Christ and διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ πνεύματος" (15:30). The one Spirit (I Cor. 12:13), the Spirit of Christ, the common sharing of which constitutes the believers the "body of Christ," is the spirit of agapē.

Paul's practical advice to the Corinthians is that "love builds up" (I Cor. 8:1). Love is the "still more excellent way" (12:31). And then follows the most exalted characterization and description of love ever to flow from human pen as Paul in 13:1-13 sings the praises of

<sup>1</sup>Gal. 5:6, 13-14. Cf. Rom. 12:9-10; 13:8; 14:15.

<sup>2</sup>The genitive (ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ) is subjective. It is first of all God's love for us, but a love identified with the presence of the Holy Spirit which is given to the believer. C. H. Dodd grasps the full impact of the verse as he writes "that in the same experience in which we receive a deep and undeniable assurance of His love for us, that love becomes the central motive of our own moral being." The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, p. 74.

agapē. It is no wonder that he could later exhort the Colossians to "put on love, which binds everything together in perfect harmony" (3:14).<sup>1</sup>

These words come in close proximity to Paul's concept of the "body of Christ" (vs. 15).<sup>2</sup> In Colossians and Ephesians Christ is spoken of as the head of the body (Col. 1:18; Eph. 1:22-23) but the basic concept remains the same.<sup>3</sup> The slight shift in manner of expression is due to the fact that Paul is defining more carefully the relations of the members to Christ. Christ as the Head of the body is the source of its life and unity: "the whole unity is Head and Body. The Body depends on the Head, but the Head does not depend on the Body."<sup>4</sup> Christians are exhorted to hold fast "to the Head, from whom the whole body, nourished and knit together through its joints and ligaments, grows with a growth that is from God" (Col. 2:19). In Ephesians this growth is essentially a growth "in love":

Rather, speaking the truth in love (ἐν ἀγάπῃ), we are to grow up in every way into him who is the head, into Christ, from which the whole body, joined and knit together by every joint with which it is supplied, when each part is working properly, makes bodily growth and builds itself up in love (ἐν ἀγάπῃ).<sup>5</sup>

The passage began with an exhortation to forbear "one another in love," being "eager to maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace."

---

<sup>1</sup>ὅς ἐστιν σύρδεσμος τῆς τελειότητος

<sup>2</sup>"And let the peace of Christ rule in your hearts, to which you were called in the one body (ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι)."

<sup>3</sup>Percy, pp. 50-54.

<sup>4</sup>Best, p. 137.

<sup>5</sup>Eph. 4:15, 16.

There is one body and one Spirit" (4:2-4).

Love, divine agapē, then, is Paul's most practical way of expressing the bond which exists between believers who are partakers together of Christ. But even the concept of agapē takes its pattern from God's love manifest in Christ, finds its content in the character of Christ and looks to the presence of Christ through the Holy Spirit for its implementation. The ultimate definition of that which binds believers together and regulates their attitudes and conduct towards one another is simply and magnificently Jesus Christ!

So at the heart of Paul's inter-Christian ethic lies Christ himself, and what those who belong to Christ are as common sharers through the Spirit of his life, defined practically as agapē. As Neugebauer expresses it: "Das neue Gesetz . . . ist Indikativ in Christo Jesu."<sup>1</sup> The ethical imperative results from the indicative of God's salvation in Christ.<sup>2</sup> It is "act what you are!" This is the force of Paul's use of koinonia in I Corinthians 1:9. In this verse the spiritual privileges and possessions indicated by varied and pregnant expressions in 1:2-8 are captured by Paul in the singularly expressive phrase *κοινωνία τοῦ . . . Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* as he prepares to come to terms with the basic internal problem of the Corinthian Church. The foundation of his argument is that they are sharers-together in Christ, a fact which renders their divisiveness inconceivable.

That this which Paul has brought to focus in 1:9 by koinonia is basic to his whole handling of the divisions in Corinth can be read-

---

<sup>1</sup>Neugebauer, p. 92.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Rudolf Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, trans. Kendrick Grobel, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951), I, 332.



ily seen. In his first discussion of the problem which continues through chapter four he begins with an appeal "by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ . . . that there be no dissension among you" (vs. 10). Soon after he asks rhetorically "Is Christ divided?" (vs. 13) that is, the Christ whose life they commonly share (vs. 9). In 3:1 because of their party spirit he labels them as "babes in Christ," implying that they were not yet fully partakers of Christ, for maturity in Christ is exclusive of such conduct. The character of Christ as indicative of the imperative to unity is stressed again in verse eleven as he declares that "no other foundation can any one lay than that which is laid, which is Christ Jesus." Then climactically, that which was implicit for his argument in 1:9 becomes explicit in 3:16-17: "Do you not know that you are God's temple, and that God's Spirit dwells in you? If any one destroys God's temple, God will destroy him. For God's temple is holy and that temple you are." So it is not going too far to conclude that by his use of koinonia Paul is linking up the oneness of the salvation in Christ with the necessity of unity within the Church.

The manner in which Paul approaches the other related problems in the church at Corinth subsumes the same basic ethical indicative. In line with the present concern are the matter of lawsuits among the brethren (6:1-11) and the problem of meat offered to idols (8:1-13). In both the appeal in principle is to agapē which is assumed in their common sharing in Christ. In the former case he concludes: "Why not rather suffer wrong? Why not rather be defrauded?" (6:7) And in the latter situation the motivating principle becomes: "Therefore, if food is a cause of my brother's falling, I will never eat meat, lest I cause

my brother to fall" (8:13; cf. vs. 12).<sup>1</sup>

In chapter ten koinonia appears in vital relation to both the Lord's Supper and the "body of Christ." While the ethical concern there belongs to the final portion of this chapter, the link of 10:16-17 does further justify a consideration of the problem of division as it affects observance of the Lord's Supper in 11:17-33. Previous considerations of 10:16-17 have demonstrated how participation in the Lord's Supper is supremely indicative of the corporateness of the people of the new covenant which centers in Christ. This Paul forcibly brought out as he interpreted the Lord's Supper as a "sharing-together" (koinonia) of the blood and body of Christ, and then drove home the corporate implication of the koinonia language by adding, "because there is one bread, we who are many are one body (that is,  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$ , 12:27), for we all partake of the one bread" (10:17).<sup>2</sup> The point is that Paul has made significant use of koinonia to stress the corporateness implicit in the observance of the Lord's Supper. So in 11:17-33 it is pertinent to examine Paul's recourse to this corporate reality as he faces the basic problem surrounding the observance of the Christian rite at Corinth.

The problem is that in the assembling of the Corinthians to-

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Rom. 14:15 where Paul is discussing the identical problem: "If your brother is being injured by what you eat, you are no longer walking in love ( $\kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha} \alpha\gamma\alpha\pi\eta\eta\varsigma$ )."

<sup>2</sup>Wendland, Die Briefe an die Korinther, p. 90, traces Paul's observation on the unity of the bread back to the unity of the cup as reported in the Synoptic tradition: "and they all drank of it" (Mark 14:23; cf. Matt. 26:27). "Diese Einheit des Kelchs entspricht genau der Einheit des Brotes bei Paulus. Durch sie verwirklicht sich die Gemeinde der Jünger als der Anfang des neuen Volkes Gottes."

n/ gether for those meetings during the course of which they eat the Lord's Supper,<sup>1</sup> gatherings which ought to be most beneficial, the result is more harm than good to the church (vs. 17). So divisive and degrading are their practices that Paul declares: "it is not the Lord's Supper that you eat" (vs. 20). It has nothing of the character of the Lord about it!<sup>2</sup> On the one hand the rich humiliated the poorer members of the church by their refusal to share the food which they brought in contradiction to the spirit of Acts 2:42-47, 4:32-35; and on the other, the same offenders ate and drank to excess: "in eating, each one goes ahead with his own meal, and one is hungry and another is drunk" (11:21). Their divisiveness<sup>3</sup> had intruded even into the holiest of worshipping actions.<sup>4</sup> Thus Paul declares, "you despise the church of God" (11:22).

To point out the real character of their sin against the church, Paul reminds them again of the meaning of the rite with which they had been climaxing their feasting. He repeats for them the tradition which he had received concerning the Last Supper which presents the covenantal significance of the Lord's offering of himself on their behalf as the basic content of the observance. And this he applies to the problem at hand:

Whoever, therefore, eats the bread or drinks the cup of the

---

<sup>1</sup>In this passage the Lord's Supper would include the love feast at which the sacrament was observed. Cf. Grosheide, p. 267.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., "The addition Lord's Supper implies that the meal is not an ordinary meal but that it received its character from the Lord."

<sup>3</sup>He writes in vs. 18 of *σχίσματα* recalling 1:10 where he first wrote of the dissensions which has rent the church into factions.

<sup>4</sup>Morris, p. 157.



Lord in an unworthy manner will be guilty of profaning the body and blood of the Lord. Let a man examine himself, and so eat of the bread and drink of the cup. For any one who eats and drinks without discerning the body eats and drinks judgement upon himself (11:27-29).

Such selfish conduct on the part of the Corinthians, Paul implies, is blind to the significance of the Lord's Supper. Any one who eats the bread and drinks the cup of the Lord in such an unworthy manner<sup>1</sup> sins against<sup>2</sup> the body ( $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ ) and blood of the Lord (vs. 27). That is, in his failure truly to recognize the offering of the life of the Lord as standing behind the rite, he discerns neither the self-sacrificial nature of the offering<sup>3</sup> nor its integral relation to the very being of the church. Upon the last fact, especially, Paul lays emphasis as he further exhorts that "anyone who eats and drinks without discerning the body ( $\tau\omicron\delta\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ ) eats and drinks judgement upon himself" (vs. 29). The crucial point lies in the reference to "the body" which recalls immediately verse twenty-seven where it is emphatically the self-offering of the Lord. But here it reaches out to include also the church as also  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$  (12:27).<sup>4</sup> The two uses are not exclusive of one another.<sup>5</sup> The former (vs. 27) defines the latter (vs. 29)

---

<sup>1</sup>Most recent writers are agreed in referring ἀναξίως to the conduct of the Corinthians in relation to one another at the Lord's Supper. Cf. Kümmel in Lietzmann, p. 186, and Higgins, The Lord's Supper in the New Testament, p. 72.

<sup>2</sup>ἐν ὀνόματι cf. Robertson and Plummer, p. 251.

<sup>3</sup>Thornton, p. 342.

<sup>4</sup>See above, pp. 295 ff.

<sup>5</sup>Cf. C. F. D. Moule, "The Judgement Theme in the Sacraments," The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology, ed. W. D. Davies and D. Daube (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1956), p. 473.

as it applies to the Christian community. They have not discerned τὸ σῶμα as σῶμα Χριστοῦ first in an inward sense because of their lack of sacrificial and therefore Christlike concern for their fellow Christians (they forgot what they were); and second in an outward sense in that they failed to view the brethren as so actually members of Christ that to sin against them is to sin against Christ himself (vs. 27; cf. 8:12).<sup>1</sup>

The Lord's Supper for Paul supremely emphasizes the unity of the Christian community in relation to Christ, and renders that unity inseparable from Christ himself. This which he first lifts out by koinonia in 10:16 (in continuity with 1:9) he brings forcibly to bear on the practical problem of the Corinthian church by his more graphic "body" analogy.

Paul's use of the "body" concept becomes most explicit in chapter's twelve to fourteen. Here he brings the corporate ethic which he implies by koinonia (1:9; 10:16) to bear upon the problem of spiritual gifts. Pride in certain gifts seems to have aggravated the spirit of divisiveness within the church. Paul recognizes the varieties of gifts, service and worship, but stresses their source as the same Spirit, the same Lord and the same God (12:4-6). All the different gifts "are inspired by one and the same Spirit, who apportions to each one individually as he wills" (12:11; cf. vss. 7-10).

---

<sup>1</sup>C. F. D. Moule points out that in vss. 29 and 31 Paul resorts to a kind of play on words to drive home his point: "this terrific sin of μὴ διακρίνειν τὸ σῶμα, is part of the same attitude which οὐχ ἑαυτὸν διακρίνει it is an all-round moral and spiritual lack of discernment and blindness --blindness to self, blindness to the value of others, and blindness to the Saviour; indeed, it is an instance of the fundamental blindness which reached its climax at the trial of

To make his point clear, Paul moves to the analogy of the body. As the many members of the body are all one so it is with Christ (vs. 12) with whom they form one body by their common partaking of the one Spirit.<sup>1</sup> Continuing in terms of his analogy (vss. 18-26) Paul lays stress on God's arrangement of the members as he willed (vs. 18; cf. vs. 24) with the purpose that there "may be no discord (σχίσμα) in the body, but that the members may have the same care for one another" (vs. 25). The unity is to be such that "if one member suffers, all suffer together; if one member is honored, all rejoice together" (vs. 26).

The corporate unity involved in the body figure Paul applies explicitly with the direct attribution ὑμεῖς δὲ ἐστε σῶμα Χριστοῦ (vs. 27a). This is their character<sup>2</sup> which is definitive for their actions and attitudes toward one another. They are σῶμα Χριστοῦ "and individually members of it" (vs. 27). So as he lists their various functions in the church (vss. 28-31) the fact that they are σῶμα Χριστοῦ is to be determinative of their attitude toward and their exercise of their respective roles. It is interesting and significant, that at this point Paul exhorts them to a more excellent way (12:31-13:13), that of agapē-love, which has been shown to be most characteristic of their inter-relationships. And this he applies especially to the problem of their most troubling gift, that of speaking in tongues (14:1-40). Again it is seen how that which Paul introduces by his use of

---

Jesus." Ibid.

<sup>1</sup>See above, pp. 299ff.

<sup>2</sup>The anarthrous construction is significant here.



koinonia in 1:9 (cf. 10:16) is crucial as he deals with another phase of the problem he faced at Corinth.

The letter to Philemon furnishes a fascinating illustration of the way in which Paul brings the common sharing in Christ, ethically conceptualized as agapē, to bear on a very practical matter. In this letter as Theo Preiss concludes, "we see life in Christ pierce more clearly and deeply than elsewhere a problem of social ethics."<sup>1</sup> And to do this, Paul makes definitive use of the koinonia language.

The letter concerns itself with Philemon's slave, Onesimus, who had run away, apparently with stolen money (vs. 18). Having come in contact with Paul in prison, Onesimus became a Christian and now is being sent back by Paul to his master with this letter, which is to be carried by Tychicus (Col. 4:7).<sup>2</sup> Paul's request to Philemon in respect to his reception of Onesimus reaches its final formulation in the words, *προσλαβού αὐτὸν ὡς ἐμέ* (vs. 17). In the prayer which precedes the precise stating of the major concern of the letter Paul expresses his desire that Philemon's partnership in the faith (*ἡ κοινωνία τῆς πίστεως*) may come to expression in the perception of every good thing among us, and this in and for Christ" (vs. 6).<sup>3</sup> With this

<sup>1</sup>Theo Preiss, "Life in Christ and Social Ethics in the Epistle to Philemon," Life in Christ, Studies in Biblical Theology No. 13 (London: SCM Press, 1954), p. 41.

<sup>2</sup>This follows the common view of the circumstances portrayed in the letter, as for example, has been recently and amply treated by C. F. D. Moule, The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Colossians and Philemon, pp. 13-37. The ingenious reconstruction of John Knox, Philemon Among the Letters of St. Paul, has not proved to be convincing. Cf. Donald Guthrie, New Testament Introduction, The Pauline Epistles, (London: The Tyndale Press, 1961), pp. 248ff.

<sup>3</sup>See above, pp. 76-77 for the discussion of the basic import

7  
 general expression Paul strikes two significant notes. First there is intimated by koinonia the fact that faith in Christ is a spiritual reality commonly shared among all Christians (*πάρτας τοὺς ἀγίους*). Second Paul suggests that this "partnership in the faith," in that it is a common possession, ought to exert a transforming effect in terms of its object, Christ, on all the inter-relationships of the church. This wish Paul tactfully encircles with assertions in verses five and seven that such is the nature of Philemon's faith.

Paul begins then in verse eight to present his specific request in a manner which is focused in his climactic appeal to Philemon, *εἰ ὅτε ἔχεις κοινωνίαν, προσλαβόντα αὐτὸν ὡς ἐμέ* (vs. 17). Here Paul brings to bear on Philemon's reception of Onesimus *ἡ κοινωνία τῆς πίστεως* of verse six. A most realistic partnership "in Christ" is presupposed in koinonia as the basis for a new attitude on Philemon's part toward his runaway slave. It is the bond between them as the "body of Christ" which Paul appeals to as the foundation of Philemon's accession to his request. This bond Paul reciprocally recognizes, for he sends Onesimus back to his master when he would prefer to keep his new son in the faith (vs. 10) with him. Also Paul wants anything that Philemon would do for him in the matter to be of his own free will (vs. 14). The same bond of the "body of Christ" is to transform Philemon's relationship to Onesimus, for he is to be received "no longer as a slave but more than a slave, as a beloved brother . . . both in the flesh and in the Lord" (vs. 16). He is to be received "both on an ordinary, human level--as a man--and on a specif-

---

of this phrase.

ically Christian level."<sup>1</sup> Applied by an apt use of the koinonia language in verses six and seventeen is the principle of Galatians 3:28 that all are one in Christ, there being no more Jew or Greek, slave or free, male or female.

The koinonia quality of life here so vividly brought to practical expression is brought out most meaningfully in Paul's request to *προσλαβού αὐτὸν ὡς ἐμέ*. Paul identifies himself with Onesimus both in personal affection and "in Christ."<sup>2</sup> And then in virtue of the same kind of relationship with Philemon he asks Philemon to "receive him as you would receive me," that is, as a fellow member of the body of Christ.<sup>3</sup> A "new-age reality" centered in Christ has invaded the old order and is transforming its most radical divisions. Here the corporate concern of the new life in Christ is most exquisitely brought out by Paul in this concrete situation by a skillful use of the koinonia

<sup>1</sup>C. F. D. Moule, The Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon, p. 148. The master-slave relationship is more certainly transcended and involved may even be the manumission of Onesimus. Theo Preiss, "Life in Christ and Social Ethics in the Epistle to Philemon," p. 40, comments: "If Paul had wished to reinstate Onesimus in a social order which must not be changed, if he had juxtaposed life in Christ to an order of creation, and love to civil justice, he would have written something like, 'my dear Philemon, in the Lord, you are brothers, and one; in the life of the world you remain each in his place socially.' Above all Paul would have respected the master's right of ownership over his slave. In actual fact Paul does no such thing: fraternity, unity in Christ, seizes upon the relation of slave and master, shatters it and fulfils it upon quite another plane. Onesimus will be considered not merely as an equal, another member of the Church, he will be a member of Philemon's family, a full brother. Thus there remains no margin of paternalism, what we have is a total fraternity."

<sup>2</sup>Cf. vss. 10, 12 and 18. In the latter he even assumes any obligations Onesimus may have to Philemon.

<sup>3</sup>Thornton, p. 40.



language.

The corporate concern evidenced in a "sharing-together" in Christ can be noted finally in Paul's two uses of koinonia with the Holy Spirit (II Cor. 13:13; Phil. 2:1). It has been established in respect to both that Paul is speaking of a common participation in the Spirit. This common participation of believers in the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Christ, brings them experientially into the "body of Christ" (I Cor. 12:13).<sup>1</sup>

In II Corinthians 13:13 this corporate sense is certainly involved in the phrase *ἡ κοινωμία τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν*. It is not merely participation, but "common" participation in the Holy Spirit which is his prayer for them. The realization of "the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God" in their continuing experience of the Spirit makes for a realistic unity among them which is ever Paul's earnest desire for this church. It is the presence of koinonia in the benediction which evinces this desire. As Plummer suggests, the reason for this fuller benediction (cf. I Th. 5:28; II Th. 3:18; Gal. 6:18; I Cor. 16:24; Phil. 4:23; Philem. 25) may well be the thought that a community in which there had been so much party spirit and contention needed such an outpouring as here suggested.<sup>2</sup>

Paul's utilization of koinonia in Philippians 2:1 is much the same, only more obvious: "So if there is any . . . *κοινωμία πνεύματος* . . . complete my joy by being of the same mind, having the same love, being in full accord and of one mind" (2:1-2). The Christ-

<sup>1</sup>See above, pp. 296-298.

<sup>2</sup>Plummer, p. 383.

ological illustration (5-11) which completes the exhortation to Christian unity by its emphasis upon humility further reinforces the conviction that Paul here by koinonia stresses that their common sharing in the Spirit ought to be a decisive factor in the quality of their corporate life as "one body in Christ" (Rom. 12:5).<sup>1</sup> By koinonia Paul brings the social implications of the Spirit's activity (cf. Eph. 2:18-22; 4:1-6; I Cor. 12:13; 3:16) to bear on his exhortation to unity. When it is remembered that for Paul the first fruit of the Spirit is agapē (Gal. 5:22; cf. vss. 13-16)<sup>2</sup> the force of his appeal can be appreciated.

This entire discussion has shown how Paul very neatly, though not often, made definite use of the koinonia language to suggest and lead the way to an application of the redemptive reality of Jesus Christ to the problem of proper Christian inter-relationships.

A "sharing-together" in the ministry of Christ.--The corporate concern involved in Paul's employment of the koinonia language becomes especially evident in respect to the on-going ministry of Christ carried on through his followers. The language is applied to the gospel task proper,<sup>3</sup> to the suffering inherent in it<sup>4</sup> and to the matter of the giving of material aid.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Martin, p. 91. He notes on p. 95 that most recent commentators supply in the last part of vs. five the same verb as in the first part thus giving to "in Christ" a corporate sense.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Schweizer, Spirit of God, pp. 77-78.

<sup>3</sup>Gal. 2:9; II Cor. 8:23; Phil. 1:4-7.

<sup>4</sup>II Cor. 1:7, 4:14; cf. Phil. 3:10; Heb. 10:33; I Peter 4:13.

<sup>5</sup>Rom. 12:13; Gal. 6:6; Phil. 4:15; I Tim. 6:18; Heb. 13:16; Rom. 15:26-27; II Cor. 8:4; 9:13.

First is the gospel task. In Galatians 2:1-10 Paul gives an account of his private<sup>1</sup> presentations of the gospel which he was proclaiming among the Gentiles to "those who were of repute" (vs. 2) in the Jerusalem church for their consideration.<sup>2</sup> The result as Paul reported it was that

when they perceived the grace that was given to me, James and Cephas and John, who were reputed to be pillars, gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship (*δεξιᾶς . . . κοινωσίας*), that we should go to the Gentiles and they to the circumcised; only they would have us remember the poor, which very thing I was eager to do (vss. 9-10).

Paul here employs koinonia to define and describe<sup>3</sup> the compact or covenant<sup>4</sup> indicated by the extending of the right hand as one of genuine partnership.<sup>5</sup> The pillar apostles, perceiving the operation of the grace of apostleship<sup>6</sup> in Paul's ministry, give full recognition to Paul and Barnabas in their Gentile mission as one on an equality with that of Peter to the circumcised. It was not that they were now admitted to a common participation in the apostolic task, but rather an open acknowledgement of the fact that the gospel to the uncircumcised was already an authentic part of it.<sup>7</sup> Thus koinonia is used by Paul to stress the mu-

---

<sup>1</sup>Paul set forth his gospel probably only at a private meeting. Burton, p. 71.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Acts 25:14 for a similar use of *ἀγαπήθημι*.

<sup>3</sup>The genitive is qualitative. Schlier, p. 45.

<sup>4</sup>Herman N. Ridderbos, The Epistle of Paul to the Churches of Galatia, The New International Commentary on the New Testament, (Grand Rapids : Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1953), p. 90.

<sup>5</sup>See above, pp. 79ff.

<sup>6</sup>Schlier, p. 45

<sup>7</sup>Ibid.



tuality and equality of the apostolic ministry regardless of the character of its recipients. The task in which they share together is one task, their common participation in which binds them realistically together in purpose and concern. For this koinonia is singularly expressive.

It would be observed at this point that Paul's partnership in the apostolic ministry involved a concern for the poor among the uncircumcised (vs. 10).<sup>1</sup> Later it will be noted how Paul makes use of the koinonia language in connexion with this phase of his task.

In continuity with the use of koinonia in Galatians 2:9 Paul can commend Titus to the church in II Corinthians 8:23 as *κοινωνὸς ἐμὸς καὶ εἰς ὑμᾶς συνεργός*.<sup>2</sup> The term koinonos (accompanied by synergos) points up the confidence in Titus which Paul expresses in 8:16-22 as he presents Titus to them as one worthy to receive from them the offering for the poor. Paul uses koinonos to express the quality of his relationship to Titus, that is, his full partnership in the Gospel task with Paul in which the offering is a vital part (cf. Gal. 2:10).

In the letter to the Philippians where a vivid sense of mutual concern pervades the entire letter this note is distinctly and characteristically struck at 1:5: *τῇ κοινωνίᾳ ὑμῶν εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον*.<sup>3</sup> Then two verses later he describes them as *συγκοινωνοὺς μου τῆς χάριτος*.<sup>4</sup> The vertical dimension of these uses

<sup>1</sup>Burton, p. 99.

<sup>2</sup>See above, pp. 31f.

<sup>3</sup>See above, pp. 41-44.

<sup>4</sup>See above, pp. 35 f.

of the koinonia language has been amply discussed above<sup>1</sup> where it was concluded in reference to 1:5 that Paul had in mind the total sharing by the Philippians with him in the gospel mission through their sympathetic feeling, their like undertaking and their specific personal aid. The emphasis in both verses lies upon the realistic bond thus founded and effected between them. Paul finds the language quite felicitous to point up in single expressions the close relation of the Philippians to him in the apostolic task. The language thus plays a significant role in his attempt to direct the attention of his readers away from their anxious concern for him to the over-riding sovereignty of the church's Lord in respect to the all-important mission of the gospel.<sup>2</sup> It strikes realistically the note of common concern but at the same time grounds it in the transcending cause of the gospel enabling their concern to be lifted to what for Paul is a higher plane than his own personal welfare. Thus it is seen how Paul uses the language both to express and to transform the corporate concern in his relation to the Philippian church. True Christian concern for one another is a concern which always submits itself to that transcendent concern of the gospel and finds the welfare of its object met in the higher concern.

Closely related to the gospel task in respect to the ongoing ministry of Christ is the matter of sufferings, for Paul looked upon his sufferings as an integral part of his apostolic ministry.<sup>3</sup> But parti-

---

<sup>1</sup>See above, pp. 288 ff.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Bonnard, p. 20. This purpose of Paul can be discerned not only from his emphasis in vss. 3-11 but also from the perspective of vss. 12-16. See especially vs. 18.

<sup>3</sup>See above, pp. 279 ff.

cularly as indicated by his use of the koinonia language, he saw these eschatological sufferings which were intimately linked with the conquest of Christ as those in which all Christians are to share. He writes to the Corinthians: "Our hope for you is unshaken; for we know that as you share in our sufferings (ὅτι ὡς κοινωνοὶ ἐστέ τῶν παθημάτων), you will also share in our comfort" (II Cor. 1:7).

The phrase κοινωνοὶ . . . τῶν παθημάτων stresses the common bond between Paul and the Corinthians rooted in sufferings as verse six makes clear. For not only as one body, σῶμα Χριστοῦ do all suffer together when one member suffers (I Cor. 12:26), but Paul goes on to identify their sufferings as the same kind as his--τῶν αὐτῶν παθημάτων (vs. 6)<sup>1</sup>. And these he has already designated as τὰ παθήματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ (vs. 5): "For as the sufferings of Christ abound for us, so also our comfort abounds through Christ (RSV margin)." Paul's experience of comfort is rooted in his sharing in Christ's sufferings, and on this basis he assures the Corinthians that as they are partners with him in suffering so they will also share with him in comfort through Christ.<sup>2</sup> In Thornton's words "comfort comes from the

<sup>1</sup>Plummer, p. 383. Cf., however, Philip E. Hughes, Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, The New International Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1962), pp. 14f., who seems to see here mainly the matter of sympathy in suffering.

<sup>2</sup>R. P. C. Hanson comments: "because Christians do not merely imitate, follow or feel inspired by Christ, but actually live in him, are part of him, dwell supernaturally in a new world where the air they breathe is his Spirit, then for them henceforward suffering accepted in Christ must bring comfort. . . . Because the Corinthians share Christ with Paul, they also share Paul's sufferings in Christ, and, as a necessary consequence, Paul's comfort." The Second Epistle to the Corinthians (London: SCM Press, 1954), pp. 32f.



fountain-source of the Messiah's sufferings. . . . The double stream of suffering and comfort has flowed from Christ to his apostle, and now flows on from the apostle to Christ's other members."<sup>1</sup> By the use of koinonos in verse seven Paul climactically clinches his thought of a mutual participation in the messianic sufferings which furnishes the ground for his assurance to them of comfort. With koinonos Paul captures the mutuality of life and concern which is to characterize the relationship between apostle and church. This was a timely emphasis as the history of Paul's relationship with this church shows.<sup>2</sup>

It is in Philippians that in a most intimate way Paul employs the koinonia language to relate the matter of suffering to the corporate concern (1:7; 4:14; cf. 3:10). The vertical dimensions of these passages have been amply discussed<sup>3</sup> and it remains only to note more specifically how Paul brings the vertical to bear on the horizontal dimension with koinonia and cognates.

In 1:7 the Philippians are Paul's συγκοινωνοὺς . . . τῆς χάριτος that is, they are partakers with Paul in the grace of his apostolic commission now expressed in the sufferings of his imprisonment (ἐν τε τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀπολογίᾳ καὶ βεβαίωσει τοῦ εὐαγγελίου συγκοινωνοὺς μου τῆς χάριτος . . .).<sup>4</sup> Paul is giving expression to a relationship so realistic between them that they could be styled Paul's "companions in

---

<sup>1</sup>Thornton, pp. 34f.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Hughes, pp. 14-16.

<sup>3</sup>See above, pp. 278-286

<sup>4</sup>See above, p. 288.

prison."<sup>1</sup> It is a witness to an affection as genuinely felt and concretely expressed that Paul sincerely looked upon them as intimate sharers in his apostolic ministry. This lies at the root of his gratefulness in regard to them (vss. 3-5) and his great confidence in them (vs. 6). Later in 4:14 he plainly speaks of their *συγκοινωνήσαστες μου τῇ θλίψει*. By their concern and help (vss. 15-16) they have joined themselves to him in that essential aspect of his ministry, in the apostolic trials which precede the end. Supremely in this letter the koinonia language bears witness to the corporateness of apostle and people, and that most vividly and meaningfully seen in the kind of suffering which lay at the heart of the ministry of Christ and that of his apostle. This is all brought to an intensive focus at 3:10 where the corporate element is not to be overlooked.<sup>2</sup>

Similar to the foregoing emphasis in Paul is Hebrews 10:33 where the readers are characterized as "being partners" (*κοινωνοὶ . . . γενήσασθε*) of those fellow Christians who are undergoing reproach and affliction, as well as receiving such treatment themselves. Also I Peter 4:13 may well include the idea of a common sharing (*κοινωνοὶ* - *γενήσασθε*) in Christ's sufferings, though obviously the accent is upon the fact that it is Christ's sufferings in which they are sharing.<sup>3</sup>

The last phase in the discussion of the corporate concern as linked to the ministry of Christ involves the "sharing-together" in the sense of concrete aid to fellow Christians. The "sharing-together

<sup>1</sup>E. F. Scott, p. 25.

<sup>2</sup>See above, pp. 284ff.

<sup>3</sup>See above, p. 286.

quality of life" which Paul so vividly brings to a focus with the koinonia language includes likewise a "sharing-out" for which he can employ the same terminology.<sup>1</sup> Such attitude and action is implicit in the nature of the koinonia or the common life as it has been defined in Paul. The roots of this of course have been traced back in turn to the common goods of the early church (Acts 2:42-46),<sup>2</sup> to the common life of the first disciples with Jesus together with his teaching on riches and charity<sup>3</sup> and to the Old Testament ethic.<sup>4</sup>

First are those expressions in Paul which are more general. In Romans 12:13, among other exhortations which are to be expressive of koinonia quality of life summed up in 12:12 as "a living sacrifice,"<sup>5</sup> Paul exhorts them to "contribute ( $\kappa\omicron\iota\nu\nu\omega\upsilon\gamma\epsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ ) to the needs of the saints."<sup>6</sup> The concern which Christians have for one another in virtue of the oneness of their life in Christ is to reach to the meeting of their mutual practical needs. As John Knox emphasizes, more than merely contributing is involved: "underlying the verb here is the realization of the church as a community ( $\kappa\omicron\iota\nu\nu\omega\nu\iota\acute{\alpha}$ ) in which the necessities of one are to be suffered by all, and the privileges of one

---

<sup>1</sup>For the more technical treatment in regard to how koinonia and cognates could be employed in this sense see the discussion beginning on page *twelve* for koinoneo and on page *twenty-four* for koinonia.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. chapter V.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. chapter IV.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. chapter III.

<sup>5</sup>Thornton, p. 21.

<sup>6</sup>See above, pp. *42f.* for the exact force of koinoneo in this passage.



are to be enjoyed by all."<sup>1</sup> This is the most general and comprehensive of Paul's uses of the koinonia language in this regard.

At Galatians 6:6 the above principle is applied to a more specific relationship, that between the Galatian Christians and their teachers: "Let him who is taught the word share (κοινωνεῖτω) all good things with him who teaches."<sup>2</sup> The sharing while certainly involving material support should not be limited to it for "the object of sharing material things was to make possible the mutuality of spiritual gifts."<sup>3</sup> As the context indicates (v. 2)<sup>4</sup> the supreme concern is spiritual with material aid being a part of that concern which rises out of the common life. The exhortation witnesses to that reciprocal sharing even to very concrete expression which ideally lay at the very heart of the early church.

The kind of mutual sharing to which Paul exhorted the Galatians was a reality in his relation to the church at Philippi:

Yet it was kind of you to share my trouble (ἐποικήσατε συγκοινωνήσατές μου τῇ θλίψει). And you Philippians yourselves know that in the beginning of the gospel, when I left Macedonia, no church entered into partnership with me in giving and receiving (ἐκοινωνήσεν εἰς λόγον δόσεως καὶ λήψεως) except you only; for even in Thessalonica you sent me help once and again. Not that I seek the gift; but I seek the fruit which increases to your credit (4:14-17).<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>John Knox, The Epistle to the Romans, p. 590.

<sup>2</sup>See above, pp. 43f.

<sup>3</sup>Stamm, p. 578.

<sup>4</sup>Schlier, p. 202f., points out that the exhortation "steht noch unter dem übergeordneten Gesichtspunkt des πνεύματος ὁδοῦ" of 5:25, and that it is likewise not to be seen apart from the warning of vss. 7-10. Cf. Duncan, p. 185.

<sup>5</sup>See above, p. 44.

Here Paul gives concrete expression to that partnership of the Philippians with him in his apostolic ministry which pervades the whole letter. This of course has already been noted in the previous discussions concerning Paul's use of the koinonia language in 1:5, 7; 3:10 and 4:15. And even there the more specific matter of material gifts was not excluded in the larger partnership. Likewise in verse fifteen the practical expression must be seen in the full context of the bond between them in the gospel. Such giving is a sharing in his afflictions (vs. 14). It is a part of a reciprocal relationship, "a double transaction"<sup>1</sup> (λόγος δόσεως καὶ λήψεως) in which the Philippians by their material contributions to Paul share with him in spiritual blessing (vss. 17, 19). This mutual sharing in this full sense appears to be unique to the relationship between Paul and the Philippians.<sup>2</sup> By koinoneo Paul can at the same time speak of the help which he has been receiving from the Philippians and refer to the broader "sharing-together" in the gospel (1:5) of which the former is an expression.

Two similar references should be noted in passing. At I Timothy 6:18 the author instructs the rich to be "generous" (κοινωνικοὺς) or ready to share with others. In like manner the writer to the Hebrews in a general exhortation (13:16) links εὐνοίας (the doing of good)<sup>3</sup> with κοινωνίας in the sense of an attitude or act of sharing what one has.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Martin, p. 179.

<sup>2</sup>"When I left Macedonia" probably refers to a particular period and then would be less than absolute. The help of other churches is implied in II Cor. 11:8 and 12:13.

<sup>3</sup>Arndt and Gingrich, p. 324.

<sup>4</sup>See above, p. 90.

Most specifically Paul applies the koinonia language to the offering which he organized in the Gentile churches for the poverty-stricken Christians in Jerusalem.<sup>1</sup> During Paul's period of service at Antioch he had taken part in a relief mission to the Christians in Judea (Acts 11:27-30). It may have been at the time of this visit to Jerusalem<sup>2</sup> that his mission to the Gentiles was fully recognized as apostolic by James, Cephas and John,<sup>3</sup> the only stipulation being that he should remember the poor, "which very thing," wrote Paul to the Galatians (2:10), "I was eager to do." This task, necessitated by the economic condition in the Jerusalem church,<sup>4</sup> Paul was already participating in. Only now it is clearly seen as an essential phase of his apostolic mission, integral to the *Σεβίαις . . . κοινωνίαις* given to Paul and Barnabas (Gal. 2:9). The Corinthian correspondence makes it evident that Paul seeks to carry out this phase of his ministry among the Gentile churches founded by him through one large collection, which when gathered, he, along with delegates from the Gentile churches, will deliver to Jerusalem (I Cor. 16:1-4; cf. Acts 20:4). The Corinthians, in the same manner as he had directed the Galatians, are to put something

---

<sup>1</sup>Rom. 16:26: "the poor among the saints in Jerusalem." II Cor. 9:12: "the wants of the saints." Cf. Munck, pp. 287ff.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 38. Others, however, identify the visit of Galatians 2:1ff. with that of the Jerusalem Council visit in Acts 15. For a full discussion see Donald Guthrie, pp. 80-86.

<sup>3</sup>See above, pp. 317ff.

<sup>4</sup>The reasons for their poverty were perhaps threefold: (1) the result of persecution, (2) there were probably many poor and very few rich among those who composed the church and (3) their dissipation of what capital resources they did possess (Acts 2:44-45; 4:43; 5:5). So C. H. Dodd, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, p. 230.



aside the first day of every week as they have prospered so that Paul need not raise the offering when he arrives.

But with the writing of II Corinthians these whose zeal Paul used to stir up the Macedonians (9:2) have not carried through with the task which they so enthusiastically began (8:10-11). So Paul with his most delicate tact sets about in chapters eight and nine to move the Corinthians to action by the example of the Macedonians. The Macedonians have evidenced the grace of God "for in a severe test of affliction, their abundance of joy and their extreme poverty have overflowed in a wealth of liberality on their part" (8:2). Such was their eagerness, Paul testifies, that they gave "beyond their means, of their own free will, begging us earnestly for the favor of taking part in the relief of the saints--(τὴν χάριν καὶ τὴν κοινωρίαν τῆς διακορίας τῆς εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους )" (8:3-4).<sup>1</sup> Koinonia, indicating the thought of participation in the offering, alludes as well to the fact that this is a shared project. Involved is not only a common participation in the collection, but a deeper relationship in the gospel (8:8-9) of which such taking part in the offering is an essential expression.<sup>2</sup> The Macedonians "first . . . gave themselves to the Lord and to us by the will of God" (8:5) was Paul's characterization of them. And so the Corinthians, since they excel in every other spiritual gift, are exhorted to "excel in this gracious work (χάριτι) also" (8:7).

---

<sup>1</sup>See above, pp. 47f.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Thornton, pp. 26f. Hauck, p. 809, comments: "Neben den hohen Wort *χάρις* ("sie erbaten von uns die Gnade") hat *κοινωνία* schwerlich nur den blassen Sinn "Beteiligung", sondern auch hier den religiösen der Gemeinschaft und Verbundenheit am Dienst gegenüber den Heiligen."

Participation in the offering rises out of a prior participation in grace.

The manner and the language<sup>1</sup> by which Paul seeks to motivate the Corinthians to complete their share of the collection in these chapters both lay stress on the spiritual character of the offering and indicates that Paul's use of koinonia is involved in that stress. In the final verses of chapter nine Paul suggests that the liberality of the Corinthians will not only meet the needs of the saints, but will overflow through many thanksgivings to God, for

by means of the test of this service, they will glorify God for the obedience of your confession in regard to the gospel of Christ, and for your liberal sharing-out attitude (*ἀνιδότης τῆς κοινωνίας*) towards them and all others; while they, with supplication on your behalf, are longing for you because of the surpassing grace of God in you (9:13-14).<sup>2</sup>

Their disposition to share<sup>3</sup> with all lies behind the actual offering through which the Jerusalem Christians will be able to glorify God because of the genuineness of the Corinthian Christians. Here Paul evidences what Munck calls the ecumenical aim of the collection.<sup>4</sup> In Paul's mind, more important than the offering itself, is the mutual recognition and love which it will effect throughout the Christian churches.<sup>5</sup> It is to this that Paul's application of the koinonia lang-

<sup>1</sup>The following words and phrases are applied to the collection in chapters 8 and 9: *χάρις* (8:4, 6, 7), *ἀνιδότης* (8:2; 9:11, 13), *εὐλογία* (9:5), *διακονία* (8:4; 9:1, 12, 13), *λειτουργία* (9:12), *ὑποταγή τῆς δμολογίας* (9:13).

<sup>2</sup>This rendering of these verses is by the writer.

<sup>3</sup>See above, pp. 45-46.

<sup>4</sup>Munck, p. 290.

<sup>5</sup>Hauck, p. 809.

uage to the matter of the collection points in these chapters.

The same can be observed in the letter to the Romans. The collection is complete and Paul is about to depart from Corinth with it for Jerusalem (15:25). He writes of the collection as a *κοινωνία* *τινᾶ* (15:26). It is the *τινᾶ* which makes *κοινωνία*, here a "sharing-out attitude," concrete and a fit object for *ποθέσθαι*.<sup>1</sup> The appropriateness of such use of koinonia is seen as Paul stresses that the Gentiles have shared in (*ἐκοινώνησαν*) the spiritual blessings of the Jerusalem church and thus pleased "to be of service to them in material blessings" (15:27). The offering evidences the debt of gratitude which the Gentile Christians owe the Jewish Christians and also the spirit of mutual sharing which lay at the heart of a common participation in the gospel. This which arose out of the Christian koinonia was also designed to strengthen the same. Paul appeals to the prayers of the Romans that "my service for Jerusalem may be acceptable to the saints" (15:31). Thus Paul applies the koinonia language to the offering in line with and as expressive of his view of its nature and purpose. This holds true in both II Corinthians and Romans.

In several phases of the ongoing ministry of Christ Paul finds the koinonia language occasionally useful as he seeks to express its corporate implications for varying purposes. Particularly felicitous are his references to material aid to fellow Christians where the language can carry the overtones of that mutual sharing-in which underlies all sharing-out. This becomes most evident in that special collection which was so vital to Paul in his mission to the Gentiles.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>See above, pp. 47-48.

<sup>2</sup>The eschatological connection of the collection as the mission



### The Ethical Exclusiveness

The preceding discussion on "the corporate concern" involved in Paul's use of the koinonia language dealt with the inter-personal ethic of the koinonia reality. This does not, however, exhaust its ethical implications. Implied in Paul's use of koinonia and cognates is likewise a more negative exclusive ethic which may be explicitly set in the context of the idea of the holy in Paul. This chapter began with what was described as Paul's most definitive and comprehensive use of koinonia in I Corinthians 1:9 where he characterizes the Corinthian Church as called into the *κοινωνία . . . Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*. Earlier in the salutation the same church is said to be *ἁγιασμένοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, κλητοῖς ἁγίοις* (I Cor. 1:2). To be "in Christ," to participate in Christ involves the idea of the holy.

In the discussion of chapter four dealing with the life and ministry of Jesus it was pointed out in the light of Judas' action and the attitude of the disciples before the cross that the holy exclusive character of the koinonia reality was that resident in Jesus himself. Sanctification consisted first of all in a personal relationship of radical loyalty and single obedience to Jesus in the full eschatological and redemptive bearing of his life and ministry as climaxed in his passion and resurrection.<sup>1</sup> Similarly in chapter five the inherent holiness of the koinonia was seen in the experience of the early church to be

---

to Israel of Paul's ministry advocated by Munck, pp. 301-305 is overdone and goes beyond the evidence. Cf. W. D. Davies, Christian Origins and Judaism (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1962), pp. 179-198.

<sup>1</sup>See above, pp. 211.

that of the eschatological action of God defined in Jesus and implemented through the Spirit. Ananias and Sapphira by their hypocritical action in relation to the church had falsified the holiness of the eschatological Spirit by which God had constituted the church and thus disrupted the cohesion of the community. So the exclusiveness of the early Christian koinonia was the ethic of radical personal obedience to that which gave it the dynamic of its being--the Spirit of the Lord.<sup>1</sup>

Likewise when Paul characterizes the Church at Corinth as sanctified (1:2)<sup>2</sup> he is thinking of those in Corinth who are called to *κοινωνία . . . Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* (1:9) in terms of their relation to the eschatological activity of God in Christ<sup>3</sup> by which the Holy God relates himself to men in a new way. As Wendland suggests:

Dreifach ist der Gedanke bestimmt: sie sind geheiligt worden, ein Handeln Gottes ist an ihnen geschehen, das sie in ein neues Sein versetzte. Zweitens, diese Heiligung ereignet sich in der Christus-Gemeinschaft. Drittens aber, geheiligt sind allein die, die Gott berufen hat.<sup>4</sup>

By the action of God in Christ they belong to the God who is holy,<sup>5</sup> but

<sup>1</sup>See above, pp. 248-251.

<sup>2</sup>The perfect participle indicates an existing condition, and the plural in apposition to the collective singular puts a passing emphasis on the individual responsibility of the Christians. So Plummer, p. 2.

<sup>3</sup>Schlatter, Paulus, Der Bote Jesus, p. 57.

<sup>4</sup>Wendland, Die Briefe an die Korinther, p. 11.

<sup>5</sup>Cf. Otto Procksch, "ἅγιος, ἁγιάζω, ἁγιασμός, ἁγιότης, ἁγιωσύνη Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. Gerhard Kittel (Stuttgart: Verlag von W. Kohlhammer, 1933), I, 101f. As in the Old Testament the New Testament characterization of God as holy contains the inmost designation of God's being or character ("die innerste Bezeichnung von Gottes Wesen"). And this is the God who has acted and who is present in Jesus Christ.

only as they are "in Christ" is this so. The quality of their participation in Jesus Christ (1:9) is the quality of their holiness. All the old boundaries between the holy and the unholy have been transcended.<sup>1</sup> The prime ethical category is again that of radical personal loyalty or commitment to Jesus Christ. The negative aspect of holiness has to do with what is excluded in such a relationship. For Paul, then, the ethical implications of the holiness of God<sup>2</sup> are centered in Jesus Christ and the character of one's relationship to God in him.

That phase of the holiness of the koinonia "quality of Life" in Paul which has to do with inter-personal ethic, particularly within the church, has already been handled when the corporate concern of the koinonia reality was discussed in relation to the divisiveness of the church at Corinth.<sup>3</sup> In the midst of his first major treatment of the problem of divisiveness Paul warns: "Do you not know that you are God's temple and that God's Spirit dwells in you: If any one destroys God's temple, God will destroy him. For God's temple is holy, and that temple you are" (3:16-17). In fact every violation of *σῶμα Χριστοῦ* (12:27; cf. 11:29) is a sin against the holy character of the Christian koinonia, whether it be party spirit (1:10-4:21), a failure of agapē (6:1-8; 8:1-13), irregularities at the Lord's Supper (11:27-33), or the misconception of the importance of spiritual gifts (12:1-14:10). As in Acts the character of the Christian community is so qualified by the Holy Spirit of God (3:16-17; 12:13) which indwells it that any lack of

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Thornton, pp. 10-11.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Lev. 19:2; I Peter 1:15-16.

<sup>3</sup>See above, pp. 308-314.



love on the part of its members towards one another is direct disobedience to Jesus Christ (8:12) in whom they are sanctified (1:2). To sin against the unity of the community was to sin against Christ--the very essence of their own eschatological existence.

While it is not directly connected with Paul's use of the koinonia language, the matter of the sanctification of the body, particularly in terms of the sins of impurity (5:1-13); 6:9-20),<sup>1</sup> is not without relation to the *κοινωνία* . . . *Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* of 1:9 and thus to the holy character of the koinonia. The extreme case of immorality dealt with in chapter five has to do as well with the purity of the corporate body (cf. vss. 6-7; 13). All immorality (*πορνεῖα*) is set forth in contradiction to being "sanctified in Christ Jesus" (1:2):

Do you not know that your bodies are members of Christ? . . . Do you not know that he who joins himself to a prostitute becomes one body with her? . . . But he who is united to the Lord becomes one spirit with him . . . . Do you not know that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit within you, which you have from God? You are not your own; you were bought with a price. So glorify God in your body (vss. 15a, 16a, 17, 19-20).

The negative implications are indeed broader yet:

Do not be deceived; neither the immoral, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor homosexuals, nor thieves, nor the greedy, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor robbers will inherit the kingdom of God. And such were some of you. But you were washed, you were sanctified, you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God (6:9b-11).

In the individual as well as in the corporate sense it is the presence of the Spirit which effects the sanctification, and sets them apart

---

<sup>1</sup>This connection is made in Ephesians 5:11 discussed below p. 337.

from all unbelievers.<sup>1</sup>

It is as he climaxes his argument against idolatry that Paul most directly and forcibly employs koinonia and koinonos in I Corinthians 10:14-22 to lay stress on the ethical exclusiveness of the common life in Christ. Paul's discussion of the general topic began with chapter eight where the specific problem was the eating of meat which had been offered to idols. Paul sees nothing wrong for those of an enlightened conscience in the eating of such meat (cf. 10:23-30), except as such eating would cause the brother of a weaker conscience to fall (8:7-13).<sup>2</sup> To eat in this case would be to sin against the brother and against Christ and to deny in action the basic nature of the koinonia (8:12). There were some, however, who were so spiritually self-confident that they even went so far as to eat in the heathen temples themselves (8:10). This practice Paul unequivocally prohibits as he moves on to the argument of chapter ten. In verses one to thirteen he cites the example of Israel, who privileged of God as they were (vss. 1-4), were nevertheless destroyed when they fell into idolatry in the wilderness (vss. 5-10), and adds the admonition: "therefore let any one who thinks that he stands take heed lest he fall" (vs. 12). With verse fourteen comes the climactic warning, "therefore, my beloved, shun ( $\phi\epsilon\upsilon\gamma\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ ) the worship of idols," a warning which he enforces by means of a unique

---

<sup>1</sup>Hamilton, p. 39.

<sup>2</sup>Some, however, question the unity of I Corinthians and attribute chapters eight and ten to different letters. Cf. Johannes Weiss, History of Primitive Christianity, completed by Rudolf Knopf, ed. F. C. Grant (New York: Wilson-Erickson, 1934) I, 340f. For a presentation and discussion of various views cf. Guthrie, The Pauline Epistles, New Testament Introduction, pp. 62-64.

application of the koinonia language to the Lord's Supper and to the contrasting idol worship.

It was demonstrated earlier that Paul's argument in I Corinthians 10:14-22 moves from the nature of participation in the Lord's Supper to the significance of participation in pagan cults, and not the opposite.<sup>1</sup> That is, he points out the spiritual significance of a Christian's participation in heathen sacrificial feasts as he interprets and applies the meaning of the Lord's Supper to the former practice. The drinking of the cup and the eating of the bread are a "sharing-together" (koinonia) in the salvation reality resident in Jesus Christ (vs. 16). By this common sharing, symbolized by the unity of the loaf which they break in the rites, they are constituted one body (vs. 17) --σῶμα Χριστοῦ (12:27). Most supremely in this high point of Christian worship as they share together in the vertical salvation reality they are brought into a unique horizontal relationship, a uniqueness that lies in the character of that which is shared in. Paul has utilized koinonia in a very apt manner to bring out that particular aspect of the meaning of the Lord's Supper which is pertinent to his argument.

After verse seventeen which forms the axis of his argument, Paul begins to apply his point to the problem at hand with a passing allusion to the cult in Israel (vs. 18). Those who join in that sacrificial meal involved possible in Israel's most significant celebration,

---

<sup>1</sup>See above pp. 55-60. The following discussion assumes the position established there. Cf. Bornkamm, "Herrenmahl und Kirche bei Paulus," p. 138.



the Passover,<sup>1</sup> constitute themselves "parnters in the worship of Israel's God (κοινωνοὶ τοῦ Θεοσλαστηρίου). And so similarly there can be no association with pagans in their sacrificial meals without involvement in that which is the formative fact in that association; that is, the worship of demons, which Paul expresses as becoming κοινωνοὺς τῶν δαίμονιων (vs. 20). The reasoning which in 10:16-17 flowed from the vertical reality to characterize the horizontal association now moves from the fact of the horizontal association to the character of the vertical participation involved in such association. It is not that Paul either believes that the meat offered to idols is basically different from any other meat, or that there is any reality to the idol (vs. 19), but it is the use of such meat as sacrificed to the powers of darkness<sup>2</sup> that constitutes the danger<sup>3</sup> to the Christian participant. As one who has been joined to the Christian koinonia by a sharing together in the blood and body of Christ, he is unable to attach himself to another koinonia whose constitutive basis is those evil powers in direct opposition to God without seriously endangering his relation to Christ. As Paul sums it up, he "cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of demons." He "cannot partake of the table of the Lord and the table of demons" (vs. 21). The two koinonia's are mutually exclusive, because of the absolute antagonism of the spiritual reality at the heart

---

<sup>1</sup>Moffatt, The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, p. 136.  
See above, p.

<sup>2</sup>Grosheide, p. 236.

<sup>3</sup>As C. F. D. Moule, Worship in the New Testament, p. 35, points out, such activity may affect ones "relationship with the unseen powers of evil and good: there may, that is, be a change of relation even though there is no change of material."

of each.<sup>1</sup>

Partaking in pagan cult meals is thus shown to be more than a sin against the koinonia in the sense of a sin against a brother, but even more direct, it is a personal sin against the very essence of the Christian koinonia. Paul was able in a very fascinating way to utilize koinonia and koinonos to drive home the exclusive character of the common life in Christ, a koinonia which finds its holiness defined in terms of an exclusive relationship to Jesus Christ, its central reality. This shared life must separate itself from all that is contrary to the life that is shared.<sup>2</sup>

In II Corinthians 6:14-7:1 Paul again employs koinonia as he uncompromisingly prohibits all unholy alliances with pagans:<sup>3</sup>

Do not be mismatched (ἐτεροδουλῶντες) with unbelievers. For what partnership (μετοχή) have unrighteousness and iniquity? Or what fellowship (κοινωνία) has light with dark-

<sup>1</sup>Craig, p. 115, overlooks the full horizontal implications of Paul's argument as he states that "the conclusion which the apostle draws is not that the Corinthians cannot belong to two fellowships at the same time. Rather, they cannot belong to two Lords, to a demon, and to Christ."

<sup>2</sup>The ethical exclusiveness of the Christian koinonia as highlighted in the Lord's Supper has also been brought out in connection with I Corinthians 11:17-32 discussed above, pp. 309-311. There the significance of the rite was shown to be exclusive of unbrotherly attitudes within the church.

<sup>3</sup>Paul does not state here just exactly what he means, but in line with the earlier epistle it surely includes such things as marriage (I Cor. 7:12-15), eating meat which had obviously been offered to idols with unbelievers (I Cor. 10:27f) and perhaps even the matter of instituting legal proceedings against a fellow Christian before unbelievers (I Cor. 6:5ff.). Certainly Paul is not condemning all intercourse with non-Christians (cf. I Cor. 5:10). Cf. Grosheide, pp. 246f., who points out that "the metaphor of the yoke which he uses here shows that he is thinking of close relationships in which, unless both parties are true believers, Christian harmony cannot be expected to flourish and Christian consistency cannot fail to be

ness: What accord ( $\sigma\upsilon\mu\phi\acute{\omega}\nu\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$ ) has Christ with Belial? Or what has a believer in common ( $\mu\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ ) with an unbeliever: What agreement ( $\sigma\upsilon\lambda\lambda\eta\gamma\eta\tau\acute{\alpha}\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma\iota\varsigma$ ) has the temple of God with idols? (6:14-16a).<sup>1</sup>

Set in a series of five rhetorical questions, light is said to share or have in common nothing with darkness. Koinonia is one of five terms employed negatively to express the absolute incongruity of the Christian koinonia with sin, the powers of evil and all their outward manifestations which do not line up with its holy character as "the temple of the living God" (6:16).<sup>2</sup> For, Paul argues,

as God said,  
 "I will live in them and move among them,  
 and I will be their God, and they shall be my people.  
 Therefore come out from them, and be separate from them,  
 says the Lord,  
 and touch nothing unclean; then I will welcome you,  
 and I will be a father to you,  
 and you shall be my sons and daughters,  
 says the Lord Almighty" (6:16c-18).<sup>3</sup>

Their holiness is an exclusive relationship to a holy God; thus the exhortation: "Since we have these promises, beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from every defilement of body and spirit, and make holiness perfect in the fear of God" (7:1). Paul has utilized koinonia to aid in enforcing the fact, that like as the holiness of God implies that God

---

compromised."

<sup>1</sup>See above, pp. 80f. As was indicated there, p. 81 (cf. fn. 2) the Pauline character of this passage is assumed and that most probably with many recent authorities (e.g. Hering, Wendland, Kümmel, Guthrie, Grosheide) as integral to the letter. Some, however, link it with the letter referred to in I Cor. 5:9. Cf. R. P. C. Hanson, The Second Epistle to the Corinthians, p. 65.

<sup>2</sup>For the Jewish mind there was a radical and absolute antipathy between the temple of God and idols. Cf. Grosheide, pp. 251f.

<sup>3</sup>Paul has loosely quoted Lev. 26:12; Ezek. 37:27; Is. 52:11; II Sam. 7:14.



does not share his glory with another (Is. 48:11; 43:11ff.; Dt. 5:9), so the Christian koinonia can have no real share in that which is not in line with that holiness of God.

A passage quite parallel in subject matter to the one just discussed and to I Corinthians 5:9-11 is Ephesians 5:3-13. The light-darkness contrast is employed as Paul exhorts them in 5:11 to "take no part ( $\mu\eta\ \sigma\upsilon\gamma\kappa\omicron\iota\nu\omega\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\epsilon$ ) in the works of darkness, but instead expose them"<sup>1</sup> (cf. vss. 8-9). Included in the works of darkness are immorality, covetousness and idolatry. Men who do such things are sons of disobedience under the wrath of God (vs. 6). With such persons (vs. 7) Paul's readers are not to associate ( $\gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon\ \sigma\upsilon\mu\mu\acute{\epsilon}\tau\omicron\chi\omicron\iota$ ). The warning of this section is set in contrast to the admonition which precedes: "be imitators of God, . . . walk in love, as Christ loved us and gave himself up for us" (5:1-2).

A last use of the koinonia language with negative implications in the literature of Paul which needs to be mentioned for the sake of completeness is I Timothy 5:22: "do not be hasty in the laying on of hands, nor participate ( $\kappa\omicron\iota\nu\omega\acute{\nu}\epsilon\iota$ ) in another man's sins; keep yourself pure." Timothy is urged not to join in or make himself responsible for the sins of others by ordaining men (cf. vss. 17, 19) prematurely.<sup>2</sup>

The "sharing-together quality of life" is seen in Paul to be radically exclusive of all conduct and associations which are not consistent with a total faith-relationship to God in Christ who stands at

---

<sup>1</sup>See above, pp. 40f.

<sup>2</sup>Jeremias, Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus, p. 84. See above, pp. 41f. The passage may refer to the restoration of penitents. Cf. fn. 4 p. 41 above.

the dynamic heart of the koinonia. The holiness of the koinonia quality of life is that of Christ in whom God is present in eschatological action. It is a matter first of inner purity, of an heart loyalty to Jesus Christ which excludes all rivals; and then second, the working out of that relationship in all the other relationships of life. The ethical exclusiveness of the latter is that of the ethical character of Christ. Paul, with the same koinonia language by which he has given varied expression to the koinonia reality, found it also useful to lay stress upon its holy or ethically exclusive character.

#### Conclusion

Both the rationale for Paul's use of the koinonia language and his concept of the koinonia are implicit in his representative expression *κοινωνίαν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν* (I Cor. 1:9). By the use of koinonia in this phrase he subtly calls attention to the corporate implications of life in Christ which he so ably brings to bear on the practical problems of the Corinthian Church in the body of the letter. The preceding study has demonstrated that in all of the occurrences of koinonia and cognates Paul has a practical aim in mind, an aim which is most often thoroughly ethical. For with these dual-dimensional words Paul can uniquely express the essential life-relation between the salvation reality of God in Christ and almost every phase of Christian responsibility.

Paul clearly stresses the fact that the bond of unity between Christians is the person of Christ himself. The essence of the koinonia is a common life, the life of Christ jointly shared in. This life in virtue of the crucifixion, resurrection and exaltation is viewed escha-

tologically as the saving activity and presence of God. The koinonia is further effected by a "sharing-together" in the Holy Spirit which can be identified dynamically as the life of Christ in redemptive action. Paul's use of the koinonia language bears witness<sup>1</sup> continually to a "sharing-together quality of life" which involves a realistic participation in the propagation of the gospel of Christ. The eschatological reality of the heart of the koinonia ever remains Jesus Christ in the full significance of his person.

Other phases of the koinonia become evident as Paul puts the language to use. All Christian inter-personal relationships are to be molded by the fact that it is in Christ that they are participating in common. By such participation they are the body of Christ. Any wrong action or attitude toward one another is a sin against that body and against Christ whose body they are, and thus against the eschatological action of God in him. For in that action is found the holy character of the koinonia. It is a holiness that excludes all that is out of character with God's action in Christ. His person is the standard of its holiness. All lack of agapē-love within the fellowship of the church, all unethical and immoral conduct and especially all compromising asso-

---

<sup>1</sup>The concept is found not merely in the occurrence of the word (or words) but rather in the context of Paul's usage. The word koinonia has not become technical for Paul in the sense that a particular content can be poured into it in every place. He has simply found it felicitous at times to give vivid expression to the practical concerns of the gospel of Christ. One speaks of "the koinonia" because the reality so designated is distinctly related to, but not identified with, the language with which Paul occasionally gives it unique expression. Cf. James Barr, The Semantics of Biblical Language (London: Oxford University Press, 1961), p. 269, who stresses that "the linguistic bearer of the theological statement is usually the sentence and the still larger literary complex and not the word or the morphological and syntactical mechanisms."



ciation with idolatry are excluded by the holiness of the koinonia. The corporate concern at this point is integral to the idea of the holy. And here perhaps is the main thrust and importance of Paul's use of the koinonia language, for by it he is forcefully able to relate the religious reality to its necessary ethical implications in life.

Another element in the corporate concern of the koinonia which is not without significance is that which centers in the on-going ministry of Christ. Paul uses koinonia and cognates to stress the oneness of the gospel task, to express the bond which exists between those who are thus engaged and to relate the sufferings thus endured to those of Christ himself. But perhaps most interesting is the aspect of a concrete sharing-out which he designates with the same language, thus rooting its motivation in a prior sharing-in. The practical implications of the koinonia for Paul go all the way to actual material help, the supreme expression being for him the offering taken among the Gentile churches for the Jerusalem church.

So with Paul the koinonia becomes more explicit. The centrality of the person and work of Jesus in the salvation activity of God as made experiential through the Holy Spirit presented in Acts is now more clearly evident and more completely expressed. A development in theological insight and expression is certainly manifest. In the same manner Paul gives a much more comprehensive picture of the way in which this "sharing-together in Christ quality of life" is to penetrate and transform every relationship of the Christian. And this he does by an actual utilization of the koinonia language itself. This use is one of Paul's most effective ways of stressing the indivisibility of religion and ethics, of one's relation to God and to his fellow man. Paul blended

them into one relation as a κοινωρία Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.



## CHAPTER VII

### KOINONIA AS EXPRESSED IN THE JOHANNINE LITERATURE

#### Introduction

The study of "the koinonia quality of life" in the New Testament leads finally to the Johannine Literature.<sup>1</sup> In this literature the koinonia language occurs most significantly in I John 1:3-7<sup>2</sup> and can be said to express the heart of Johannine theology.<sup>3</sup> So the Johannine witness to "the koinonia," like Paul's, is important as creatively interpretative of that "sharing-together quality of life" which came into full view first in the Acts of the Apostles.

The usage of koinonia in I John 1:3-7 is unique in the New Testament due to the peculiar character of Johannine thought which W. F. Howard has characterized as "the most highly developed in the New Testament."<sup>4</sup> J. A. T. Robinson while affirming the extraordinarily mature theology of the Johannine writings would caution against removing their theology further from the primitive witness than Paul,

---

<sup>1</sup>The term is used here for the Fourth Gospel, the Epistles and the Apocalypse which have been traditionally associated with the name of the Apostle John, and which in some sense belong together as distinct from the remainder of the New Testament.

<sup>2</sup>The only exceptions are II John 11 and Revelation 1:9 and 18:4.

<sup>3</sup>See above p. 100.

<sup>4</sup>W. F. Howard, Christianity According to St. John (London: Duckworth, 1943), p. 19.



for he believes that the theology of the Fourth Evangelist reached its essential maturity by about the same time as that of Paul.<sup>1</sup> So it is possibly more the distinctive understanding rather than the later development of the Johannine interpretation of the Christ event in the New Testament<sup>2</sup> which gives significance to its expression of the koinonia reality. It must be kept in mind, however, that in respect to the koinonia language, any development in its usage is more in concept than in the terminology itself. For even here in I John it was concluded that "the resultant meaning cannot be divorced from its broader foundations."<sup>3</sup>

Koinonia occurs in I John 1:3-7<sup>4</sup> four times with the same basic content which roots in the meaning of koinonia simply as "sharing" (cf. Acts 2:42; Gal. 2:9). In each instance it connotes a Lebensgemeinschaft<sup>5</sup> or common sharing of life. The same three phases of the koinonia reality are again evident as this "common life"<sup>6</sup> is

<sup>1</sup>J. A. T. Robinson, "A New Look on the Fourth Gospel," Twelve New Testament Studies, Studies in Theology No. 34 (Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1962), p. 102. This article was first printed in 1959. Cf. E. R. Goodenough, "John a Primitive Gospel," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXIV (1945), 145-82.

<sup>2</sup>This does not necessarily militate against the relative lateness of the literature in which the theology finds expression.

<sup>3</sup>See above, p. 102.

<sup>4</sup>See the discussion of this passage above pp. 95-101.

<sup>5</sup>Bernard Weiss, p. 28. Cf. Friedrich Hauck, Die Briefe des Jacobus, Petrus, Judas und Johannes, Das Neue Testament Deutsch (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1957), p. 119.

<sup>6</sup>As The New English Bible (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961), very aptly translates koinonia at I John 1:3 and 7.

characterized as "with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ" (vs. 3), as "with one another" (vs. 7, also vs. 3 "with us") and as present only when men do not "walk in darkness" (vs. 6) but "walk in the light as he is in the light" (vs. 7). The task of this chapter is to follow this pattern taking up in order the divine essence, the corporate ethic and the exclusive character of what in I John can be characteristically designated "the common life." The discussion, while involving the thought of the Gospel and Epistles, will take both its fundamental perspectives and its final point of reference from the employment of koinonia in I John 1:3-7 where it gives expression to the practical essence of Johannine thought.

Although it is outside the purpose and limits of this present study to delve deeply into any of the intricate introductory problems surrounding the Johannine literature,<sup>1</sup> it may be of value to outline the tentative perspective in regard to a few of them which is presupposed in the following discussion. All five books appear to come from the same circle of the church though a separate authorship for the Apocalypse seems most likely, due to its linguistic peculiarities and marked difference in subject matter.<sup>2</sup> This issue, however, is

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. the articles on the Johannine writings in The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, E-J (ed. George A. Buttrick, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962), 932-955; Ernst Haenchen, "Neuere Literature zu den Johannesbriefen," Theologische Rundschau, XXVI (1960), 1-43, 267-291; Ernst Haenchen, "Johanneische Probleme," Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, LVI (1959), 19-55; W. F. Howard, The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation (4th ed. rev. C. K. Barrett; London: The Epworth Press, 1955); P. H. Menoud, L'Évangile de Jean d'après les Recherches récentes (2nd ed.; Neuchâtel and Paris: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1947).

<sup>2</sup>Cf. W. F. Howard, Christianity According to St. John, pp. 13-15. The evidence is presented in detail by R. H. Charles,

not a closed one.<sup>1</sup> The common authorship of the Gospel and the Epistles can be more readily assumed. The (cogent) arguments of C. H. Dodd<sup>2</sup> against a unity of authorship on linguistic and theological grounds have been satisfactorily met for the most part<sup>3</sup> by W. F. Howard<sup>4</sup> and W. G. Wilson.<sup>5</sup> Similarly many recent studies have

A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John, I, xxix-1.

<sup>1</sup>P. H. Menoud in the second edition of his book, L'Évangile de Jean d'après les Recherches récentes (1947), p. 74, writes that the opinion that the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse came from the same author "est loin d'être unanime . . . toutes les opinions sont aujourd'hui représentées, la discussion n'est pas close." Cf. Guthrie, New Testament Introduction: Hebrews to Revelation (London: The Tyndale Press, 1962), pp. 254-269.

<sup>2</sup>C. H. Dodd, "The First Epistle of John and the Fourth Gospel," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, XXI (1937), 129-156; and also his Johannine Epistles (1946), pp. xlviii-lvi. Dodd reopened the issue which had been fairly closed by Robert Law, Tests of Life (1909), pp. 339-363, and A. E. Brooke, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Johannine Epistles (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928), pp. i-xxvii, in refutation of H. Holtzmann's articles in Jahrbuch für Protestantische Theologie (1881), pp. 690ff., (1882), pp. 128ff., 136ff., 460ff.

<sup>3</sup>Among those who have not been convinced can be listed C. K. Barrett, The Gospel According to St. John (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1955), p. 51; Amos Wilder, "I, II and III John," Interpreter's Bible, ed. Nolan B. Harmon (New York: Abingdon Press, 1957), XII, 214-215; Haenchen, "Neuere Literatur zu den Johannesbriefen," pp. 4-8. On the other hand, one so currently involved in Johannine research as J. A. T. Robinson says, "I am persuaded that the Gospel and the three Epistles all come from the same pen and are addressed to the same community, though in a different situation." "The Destination and purpose of the Johannine Epistles," Twelve New Testament Studies, p. 126. This article was first printed in 1960. Cf. the most recent treatments of the problem by Guthrie, New Testament Introduction, Hebrews to Revelation (London: The Tyndale Press, 1962), pp. 198-203; and Rudolf Schnackenburg, Die Johannesbriefe, Vol. XII; Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, ed. Alfred Wikenhauser and Anton Vögtle (2nd ed.,



declared in favor of the essential unity or integrity of both the Gospel<sup>1</sup> and the First Epistle<sup>2</sup> though dissenters remain.<sup>3</sup> In the

Freiburg: Herder, 1963), pp. 34-38.

<sup>4</sup>W. F. Howard, "The Common Authorship of the Hohannine Gospel and Epistles," Journal of Theological Studies, XLVIII (1947), 12-25. This has been reprinted in W. F. Howard, The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation (4th ed. rev. C. K. Barrett; 1955), pp. 282-296.

<sup>5</sup>W. G. Wilson, "An Examination of the Linguistic Evidence Adduced Against the Unity of Authorship of the First Epistle of John and the Fourth Gospel," Journal of Theological Studies, XLVIII (1948), pp. 147-156. T. W. Manson in an essay first written in 1947 very interestingly finds that "some of the most striking differences between the Gospel and the Epistle turn out on closer examination to be differences between the Aramaisng half of the Gospel and the Epistle." Holding to their unity he suggests "that the Epistle is the work of a writer composing freely and the Gospel the work of the same writer with his style to some extent controlled by the material which he has to incorporate into his book." "The Fourth Gospel," Studies in the Gospels and Epistles, ed. Matthew Black (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1962), pp. 116-117.

<sup>1</sup>Cf. W. F. Howard, The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation, pp. 95-109; Eduard Schweizer, Ego Eimi (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1939), pp. 82-112. T. W. Manson, "The Fourth Gospel," pp. 113-117; J. A. T. Robinson, "A New Look at the Fourth Gospel," pp. 96-98. Robinson points out that the source criticism of Rudolf Bultmann, Das Evangelium des Johannes, Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament (11th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1950), has been found untenable by P. H. Menoud, L'Évangile de Jean d'après les Recherches récentes, E. Ruckstuhl, Die literarische Einheit des Johannes-evangeliums, Studia Friburgensia, Neue Folge, Heft 3 (Freiburg in der Schweiz: 1951), and B. Noack, Zur johannischen Tradition (Kopenhagen: Rosenkilde og Bagger, 1954).

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Otto Piper, "I John and the Primitive Church," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXVI (1947), pp. 446-451 and Wolfgang Nauck, Die Tradition und der Charakter des ersten Johannesbriefes, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr Paul Siebeck, 1957), who have subjected the theories of E. von Döbshütz, "Johanneische Studien," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, VIII (1907), 1-8; and Rudolph Bultmann, "Analyse des ersten Johannesbriefes," Festgabe für Adolph

Gospel the author's free use of primitive tradition,<sup>1</sup> most probably oral,<sup>2</sup> is not to be denied; and in the First Epistle if any source is employed it most probably comes from the same hand as the whole of the letter.<sup>3</sup>

While the identity of the author remains somewhat of a mystery, recent studies have suggested that the tradition which ascribes the Gospel and Epistles to the Apostle John may not be as unreasonable as was once thought. P. H. Menoud in his survey of Johannine research in 1947 commented that the opponents of the tradition "n'ont pu apporter la preuve décisive qu l'apôtre Jean ne pourrait être l'auteur des livres qui portent son nom."<sup>4</sup> T. W. Manson the same year argued brilliantly that the Fourth Gospel is based on a body of tradition, largely independent of the Synoptic tradition, stemming from Jerusalem which found its way to Ephesus by way of An-

---

Jülicher (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr Paul Siebeck, 1927), pp. 138-158, "Die kirchliche Redaktion des ersten Johannesbriefs," In Memoriam Ernst Lohmeyer (Stuttgart: 1951), pp. 181-201, to detailed examination and criticism. For a most recent discussion of the problem and its literature cf. Schnackenburg, pp. 11-15.

<sup>3</sup>For the dissenting opinions cf. the recent articles of Haenchen, "Johanneische Probleme," pp. 50-54 and "Neuere Literature zu den Johannesbriefen," pp. 8-20.

<sup>1</sup>T. W. Manson, "The Fourth Gospel," P. 117.

<sup>2</sup>J. A. T. Robinson, "The New Look on the Fourth Gospel," pp. 97f.

<sup>3</sup>Nauck, pp. 67-127; also Guthrie, New Testament Introduction, Hebrews to Revelation, pp. 197-198.

<sup>4</sup>P. H. Menoud, L'Évangile de Jean d'après les recherches récentes, p. 76. He adds, "On peut dire sans trop s'avancer que les défenseurs de l'authenticité johannique occupent aujourd'hui des positions plus favorables qu'au début du siècle, par exemple."

tioch. Its prime authority was an anonymous disciple of Jesus who may or may not have accompanied that tradition on its travels.<sup>1</sup>

J. A. T. Robinson in 1959<sup>2</sup> maintained that the author of the Gospel did not piece together written sources but placed his stamp with sovereign freedom upon the oral tradition of his community, which became his own in a unique way.<sup>3</sup> The basis of the tradition as seen both in its thought forms<sup>4</sup> and in its knowledge of the topography and institutions of Palestine prior to the Jewish war<sup>5</sup> was in Southern Palestine between the crucifixion and the fall of Jerusalem. Robinson feels that this tradition reached its mature form during this period; and regardless of the actual date of writing,<sup>6</sup> its continuity with the

---

<sup>1</sup>T. W. Manson, "The Fourth Gospel."

<sup>2</sup>J. A. T. Robinson, "The New Look on the Fourth Gospel."

<sup>3</sup>Robinson would say, "he is his own tradition," referring to Menoud, L'Évangile de Jean d'après les recherches récentes, pp. 76-77, who concludes: "Les recherches récentes ont justement mis en lumière ceci: au point de vue littéraire comme au point de vue théologique, Jean s'appuie sur la tradition et la dépasse; il fait preuve à la fois de fidélité et de liberté. Il connaît la tradition évangélique; tantôt il la suit, tantôt il s'en écarte. Il connaît la théologie du Fils de l'homme, par laquelle l'Eglise naissante a exprimé sa foi au Kyrios, mais il ne craint pas d'exprimer le message de Jésus dans une langue nouvelle et avec des pensées nouvelles. Bref, Jean agit avec l'indépendance, la souveraineté de quelqu'un qui aurait pu dire: la tradition, c'est moi! Au terme de l'âge apostolique, il ne restait qu'un homme qui ait pu parler ainsi."

<sup>4</sup>Here he makes reference to the Dead Sea Scrolls on which see especially R. E. Brown, "The Qumran Scrolls and the Johannine Gospel and Epistles," The Scrolls and the New Testament, ed. Krister Stendahl (London: SCM Press, 1958), 183-207. For a contrasting view cf. Howard M. Teeple, "Qumran and the Origin of the Fourth Gospel," Novum Testamentum, IV (October 1960), 6-25.

<sup>5</sup>Cf. A. M. Hunter, "Recent Trends in Johannine Studies," The



earliest days of Christianity is based "not merely in the memory of one old man, but in the life of an on-going community."<sup>1</sup> Hunter interestingly concludes his comments on recent trends in Johannine studies with the question:

Could it have been the Apostle John himself? . . . We cannot disprove it; yet many of the objections to such a view . . . give us pause. What we may hold contra mundum is that the Beloved Disciple was the Apostle John, and that his testimony stands behind the Gospel. But if not the Apostle, why not a close disciple of the Apostle, himself a Palestinian Jew, who, having known the Holy Land in the first half of the century, later made his way to Ephesus?<sup>2</sup>

As has been indicated, the Palestinian or Hebraic character of the Johannine tradition is becoming increasingly recognized.<sup>3</sup> T. W. Manson illustrating it with the crucial example of the Johannine Logos doctrine is convinced that "the Fourth Gospel and the First Epistle of John are fundamentally Hebraic rather than Hellenic in character."<sup>4</sup> J. A. T. Robinson in agreement with W. C. van Unnik<sup>5</sup> con-

---

Expository Times, LXXI (1959-1960), 164-167, 219-222.

<sup>6</sup>Hunter suggests that the Gospel might have been written about 80, or even a decade earlier. Ibid., p. 22.

<sup>1</sup>Robinson, "The New Look on the Fourth Gospel," p. 106. He closes his discussion by saying, "if we do assert this continuity, it is obviously going at one and the same time to reduce the necessity for making everything depend upon apostolic authorship and to make us very much more open to its possibility."

<sup>2</sup>Hunter, "Recent Trends in Johannine Studies," p. 222.

<sup>3</sup>For example U. E. Simon, "Eternal Life in the Fourth Gospel," Studies in the Fourth Gospel, ed. F. L. Cross (London: A. R. Mowbray and Co., 1957), p. 97, opens his article by stating that "the Gospel retains, despite its Hellenistic colouring, a Hebraic setting and feeling."

<sup>4</sup>T. W. Manson, "The Fourth Gospel," P. 118.

<sup>5</sup>W. C. van Unnik, "The Purpose of St. John's Gospel," Studia

cludes that the Gospel belonged to the world of Hellenistic Judaism, for John's purpose was to commend Christianity to a Greek-speaking Diaspora Judaism.<sup>1</sup> The Epistles, in many respects as Jewish as the Gospels,<sup>2</sup> were written to the same community in a different situation. Their purpose is a pastoral warning against an incipient Gnosticism which was threatening to lead the community away from both Judaism and Christianity.<sup>3</sup>

### The Common Life: The Divine Perspective

The Word of Life.--It is as the stated purpose of a distinctly Christian witness and proclamation that John<sup>4</sup> first writes of "the *koinonia*" as such: ὁ ἑώρακάμεν καὶ ἀκηκόαμεν, ἀπαγγέλλομεν καὶ δοῦναι, ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς κοινωνίαν ἔχητε μεθ' ἡμῶν (I Jn. 1:3a). What he has in mind by this common life

Evangelica, ed. Kurt Aland, F. L. Cross, Jean Danielou, Harold Riesenfeld and W. C. van Unnik, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur, ed. Kurt Aland, Walther Eltester und Erick Klostermann (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1959), pp. 382-411. He argues that "the purpose of the Fourth Gospel was to bring the visitors of a synagogue in the Diaspora (Jews and Godfearers) to a belief in Jesus as the Messiah of Israel. . . . It was a missionary book for the Jews." p. 410.

<sup>1</sup>J. A. T. Robinson, "The Destination and Purpose of St. John's Gospel," Twelve New Testament Studies, Studies in Biblical Theology No. 34 (Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1962), pp. 107-125. This article was first printed in 1960.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Nauck, pp. 84-127.

<sup>3</sup>J. A. T. Robinson, "The Destination and Purpose of the Johanne Epistles," pp. 126-133. Cf. Nauck's conclusion pp. 126-127. Cf. also Guthrie, New Testament Introduction, Hebrews to Revelation, p. 195-198; Schnackenburg, pp. 15-42.

<sup>4</sup>For the sake of convenience, if nothing else, the name John will be used to denote the common author of the Gospel and

which his readers are to share with him is made clear as he adds:

καὶ ἡ κοινωρία δὲ ἡ ἡμετέρα μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (vs. 3b). It is a

life-sharing "with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ." Such use of koinonia here and in verses five to seven has been seen to stand in intimate relation to the concept which John more usually expresses verbally by *ἐῖρα* ἐν and *μέλειν* ἐν (cf. I Jn. 2:6; 24; 4:12ff.; Jn. 14:20-23; 15:4-11; 17:20-23).<sup>1</sup> His usage of this terminology will be instructive as the significance of the vertical dimension of the koinonia language in the Johannine literature is more fully probed.

The proclamation, which is instrumental to this "life-sharing with the Father and his Son Jesus Christ," is concerned with what John designates τοῦ λόγου τῆς ζωῆς : "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon and touched with our hands, concerning (περὶ) the word of life--" (vs. 1). In the expression "the word of life" the main point is made by the genitive ζωῆς which either may qualify or be in apposition to λόγου : the word which contains and communicates life, or the word which is life!<sup>2</sup> Westcott suggests that "the two interpretations are not to be sharply separated."<sup>3</sup> Especially is this

---

the Epistles.

<sup>1</sup>See above pp. 99-101. Cf. Seesemann, 96-98. Related as well are such Johannine expressions as "knowing" (John 17:1; I John 2:3-4) and "having" (I Jn. 2:23; 5:12; II Jn. 9) the Father and the Son.

<sup>2</sup>Schnackenburg, p. 61.

<sup>3</sup>Westcott, The Epistles of St. John, p. 7. For him the word



so if the  $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$  is here to be considered personal.<sup>1</sup> That life is the category which relates the word to the situation of men is evident in the explanatory parenthesis which immediately follows: "the life was made manifest, and we saw it, and testify to it, and proclaim to you the eternal life ( $\tau\eta\nu\ \xi\omega\eta\nu\ \tau\eta\nu\ \alpha\iota\omega\nu\iota\omicron\nu$ ) which was with ( $\pi\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ ) the Father and was made manifest to us--" (vs. 2). The reference is obviously to the incarnation by means of which "the eternal life which was with the Father" was revealed to men (cf. I Jn. 5:11-13; Jn. 1:4). It is readily seen that the Johannine concept of eternal life is involved in that Lebensgemeinschaft which he expresses by koinonia in verse three; and thus it will become the object of special attention later in the discussion of "the divine perspective."

Now, however, the main concern remains the phrase, "the word of life," with which the proclamation is uniquely involved. By  $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\upsilon$  as qualified by  $\xi\omega\eta\varsigma$  John is emphasizing the revelatory character of that to which he is witnessing in the four symmetrical clauses each beginning with the neuter pronoun  $\acute{o}$ .<sup>2</sup> That to which he is referring contains and expresses the very life of God.<sup>3</sup> So the phrase "word of

---

is here equivalent to revelation. His concluding comment is: "The revelation proclaims that which it includes; it has, announces, gives life. In Christ life as the subject and life as the character of the Revelation were absolutely united."

<sup>1</sup>Ibid.

<sup>2</sup>Law, p. 369, rightly suggests that  $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\ \dots\ \xi\omega\eta\varsigma$  should be taken "as an independent co-ordinate clause, supplying an additional definition of the object of the apostle's announcement."

<sup>3</sup>For the revelational significance of the term  $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$  cf. John 1:1-18, whose immediate background is the biblical concept of the Word of the Lord by which the heavens were made (Gen. 1:1-31; Ps. 33:6; Wisdom of Solomon 9:1), and came to

life" plays a significant role in the opening three verses of I John where it is necessary to keep in view with Schnackenburg that "es handelt sich nicht bloss um die Weitergabe einer Botschaft, sondern um die Erfahrung und Vermittlung einer göttlichen Realität."<sup>1</sup> But is the author's reference to "the life-giving Word of God which came to men through Christ and is embodied in the Gospel,"<sup>2</sup> or primarily to "die geschichtliche Gestalt Jesu Christi."<sup>3</sup> That is, is his use of *λόγος* personal as in John 1:1-18 or more general as in Philippians 2:16?<sup>4</sup>

Kittel, referring to verse one through three in respect to

---

God's people through his prophets; the Word of God which is also His Law (Is. 2:3; Ps. 119); which in turn is equated with the creative, immanent and revealing Wisdom of God (Prov. 8:22-31; Wisdom of Solomon 7:22-8:1; Ecclesiasticus 24:23). C. H. Dodd, The Johannine Epistles, p. 4. For fuller treatment of the background and significance of *λόγος* cf. Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, p. 258, who writes that as a title *λόγος* expresses "the unity in historical revelation of the incarnate and the pre-existent Jesus. In connection with this, it also clarifies the relation between Christ and God as it is understood in the New Testament." C. H. Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1953), pp. 263-285; Albert Debrunner, Hermann Kleinknecht, Otto Procksch and Gerhard Kittel, "*λέγω, λόγος, ρῆμα, λαλέω*" Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. Gerhard Kittel (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1942), IV, 69-147; and W. F. Howard, Christianity According to St. John, pp. 34-56.

<sup>1</sup> Schnackenburg, p. 50.

<sup>2</sup> Dodd, The Johannine Epistles, p. 5; with Westcott, The Epistles of St. John, p. 6; Brooke, p. 5; and Wilder, "I, II and III John," p. 219.

<sup>3</sup> Kittel, "*λέγω, λόγος, ρῆμα, λαλέω*" p. 130; with Law, pp. 44-45; Hauck, Die Briefe des Jakobus, Petrus, Judas und Johannes, p. 118; and Schnackenburg, p. 51.

<sup>4</sup> *λόγον ζωῆς ἐπέχοντες* Cf. Mt. 13:19; Acts 13:26; 20:32; I Cor. 1:18; II Cor. 5:19; Col. 1:5; II Tim. 2:15.

which he notes that the apostle cannot overemphasize "die geschichtliche, raumzeitliche Konkretetheit des 'Erschienenen,'" unequivocally affirms that it "ist ausser Frage, dass der λόγος die geschichtliche Gestalt Jesus Christi sein soll."<sup>1</sup> He goes on to explain:

In seiner Begegnung mit dieser geschichtlichen Erscheinung hat der Apostel das "Wort" "gehört" und "gesehen." Das heisst: er hat nicht bloss "Worte mit dem Ohr aufgenommen; es ist nicht nur die durch den redenden und lehrenden Jesus vermittelte Offenbarung, sondern die Christus-Tatsache als solche."<sup>2</sup>

When justice is done to the unmistakable parallelism between the prologues of the Gospel and I John which militates for a similar significance of λόγος in each,<sup>3</sup> and to the anacoluthic structure of the verse, that is, the four neuter relatives<sup>4</sup> and the disturbing περί; the choice cannot be simply between the message about Christ

<sup>1</sup>Kittel, "λέγω, λόγος, ῥῆμα, λαλέω," p. 130.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Law, p. 44. Schnackenburg, p. 51, insists on the significance of the similarity: "Schon die anfängliche Vermeidung des Namens Jesus Christus, der gleiche Ausgangspunkt von der ἀρχῇ, die zentrale Stellung des Logosbegriffs, die Wichtigkeit der ὡς-Aussagen führen auf die gleiche Ebene. Wichtiger aber ist der gemeinsame Kerngedanke, dass der Logos der die Fülle des göttlichen Lebens in sich trägt, in einer geschichtlichen Stunde 'Fleisch wird' (Joh 1, 14) bzw. 'erscheint' (1 Joh 1, 2) und sich in seinem Wesen den Augen des Glaubens enthüllt (ἐθεασάμεθα Joh 1, 14; ἐωράκαμεν 1 Joh 1, 2)." C. H. Dodd, The Johannine Epistles, pp. 1-5, however, sees more of a dissimilarity between the two at this particular point.

<sup>4</sup>For Dodd, The Johannine Epistles, p. 3, the neuter relatives preclude the reference to Christ as the Logos. But Schnackenburg, p. 59, finds no difficulty, insisting that the neuter often appears for the masculine in the Johannine literature. But except for possibly John 4:22-23 and 17:9-10 the parallels he cites are not exactly such, for John 3:5-6 has to do with a substantive participle and John 6:37, 39-40; 17:2 and I John 5:4-5 are the more common πάντες.



and the person of Christ. Kittel suggests that John avoided the masculine relative in place of the neuter  $\delta'$  which would have made for a simple personal identity because of the paradoxical difficulty of "seeing with the eyes" and "touching with the hands" a "word."<sup>1</sup> More important for the present point is the observation of Nigel Turner that when the neuter gender refers to a person "the emphasis is less on the individual than on some outstanding general quality."<sup>2</sup> The preposition  $\pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}$ , on the otherhand, possibly was used in lieu of the more expected accusative to prevent the readers from misunderstanding the phrase merely as "the message of life."<sup>3</sup> So it is perhaps more the message as embodied in the Christ-event in view of its unique, yet continuing, revelatory and redemptive character: "das einmalig-einzigartige Heilsereignis, durch das das Ewig-Göttliche in irdischen Bereich erschien."<sup>4</sup> As Hauck suggests, John is writing of Christ not "als von einer leiblichen Person, sondern sächlich von dem, was sein Wesen ausmacht."<sup>5</sup> The identification between Jesus Christ as implied in the first four clauses of verse one and the  $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$  in the last is to be conceived in a dynamic manner.<sup>6</sup> The interpretative crux is that

---

<sup>1</sup>Kittel, " $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega$ ,  $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ ,  $\rho\acute{\eta}\mu\alpha$ ,  $\chi\alpha\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ ," p. 131.

<sup>2</sup>Nigel Turner, Syntax, Vol. III of James Hope Moulton, A Grammar of New Testament Greek (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1963), p. 21.

<sup>3</sup>Schnackenburg, p. 60, n. 4.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 49.

<sup>5</sup>Hauck, Die Briefe des Jakobus, Petrus, Judas und Johannes, p. 117.

<sup>6</sup>Kittel, " $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega$ ,  $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ ,  $\rho\acute{\eta}\mu\alpha$ ,  $\chi\alpha\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ " p. 130: "Die Gleichsetzung ' $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$  gleich Jesus Christus' ist, wie der Satz 1 J 1, 1 sehr deutlich zeigt, eine noch ganz dynamische,

of life, the life which is presently revelatory and redemptive.<sup>1</sup> Rather than absolutely designated as the Word, Jesus is given the attribute "Word of Life."<sup>2</sup> "That which was from the beginning,"<sup>3</sup> is the preexistent and incarnate Word viewed explicitly as the one who in relation to men is the fullness of the divine life, as John makes explicit in the parenthesis of verse two.<sup>4</sup> So as such "the

noch gar nicht zur eigentlichen -- weder begrifflichen noch mythischen -- Personifikation gewordene."

<sup>1</sup>This of course is the whole point of the qualification of λόγος by ζωῆς. It is interesting that Westcott, The Epistles of St. John, pp. 7f., who translates the phrase as "the message of life" when interpreting the significance of περί comments that "the subject is not simply a message." His view in the final analysis is similar to the one taken here: "He does not announce Christ or the revelation of life, but he announces something relating to both. Christ is indeed the one subject of his letter, yet not the Person of Christ absolutely but what he had himself come directly to know of Him." Somewhat similar is Wilder, I, II and III John, p. 217: "What is proclaimed as tangibly experienced is the primal divine reality manifested both as life and truth."

<sup>2</sup>Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, p. 268.

<sup>3</sup>The reference is not merely to the beginning of the proclamation of the Gospel among the readers (I John 2:7, 24; 3:11) but as in 2:13, τὸν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς to the preexistence or "uranfänglich-göttlichen Sein" of its personal wearer. Schnackenburg sees this evidenced by "das ἦν und die Aufnahme der Wendung durch περί τοῦ λόγου τῆς ζωῆς." pp. 58-59. Cf. Edwyn C. Hoskyns, The Fourth Gospel, ed. F. N. Davey (London: Faber and Faber, 1947), p. 160, where I John 1:1-4 is discussed in relation to Mark 1:1, "the beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ."

<sup>4</sup>Hoskyns, p. 160, concludes that here the word (of life) ceases to be merely a message proclaimed. The disciples have seen, gazed upon, handled . . . the Word of life and the Word is Jesus. So the neuter, "that which we have heard, merges into a masculine, for the author is describing the relation of the disciples to Jesus and through Him to God." Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, p. 268.

word of life" is the object of the proclamation which the author presents as basic to "the koinonia" of verse three. The witness is not merely to a message but to a life that incorporates the message, for John's stated purpose is the communication of life, that his readers may share in "the common life" which "is with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ."

The Word as integral to the divine dimension of the koinonia reality is applied to Jesus from Nazareth in Galilee to reveal him as the bearer of the fullness of the life of God among men. In both Gospel and Epistle the concept is the same in essential, differing only in consistency with the varying emphasis of their respective contexts. In line with the evangelistic purpose of the Gospel over against an unbelieving world, the stress is more directly on the person of the Word who as the only-begotten Son is the revealer of the divine life. The Epistle, being more pastoral in its orientation to Christian readers endangered by error, shifts its emphasis more to the life itself which cannot be conceived of apart from the incarnate Son as the eternal Word in whom it is imparted.<sup>1</sup> The distinction in perspective which attends John's use of his λόγος concept is basically that which stems from "that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing, you may have life in his name" (Jn. 20:31) on the one hand, and that "you who believe in the name of the Son of God . . . may know that you have eternal life." (I John 5:13).<sup>2</sup> Both uses are concerned with valid faith-experience

<sup>1</sup>Cf. W. F. Howard, Christianity According to St. John, pp. 55f.

<sup>2</sup>Law, p. 197, points out that "while the theme common to both



which centers in Jesus Christ as the Son of God.<sup>1</sup>

Jesus Christ, the Son of God.--Jesus the Son as the revelation of the life of God, in whom the Johannine koinonia supremely centers, was indispensably the Jesus who became incarnate in human flesh:

"that . . . which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon and touched with our hands . . ." (I Jn. 1:1). In this opening assertion the perfect tense of the first two verbs brings out the continuing significance of the witnessed facts and the aorist tense of the following verbs reinforces their emphasis on actual personal observation.<sup>2</sup> At the heart of the writer's observation is obviously a reference to the attestation by eyewitnesses to the Historical facts about Jesus Christ.<sup>3</sup> As to this there can be little doubt,<sup>4</sup> but the actual relation of the writer and his use of the plural pronoun "we,"<sup>5</sup> in contrast to the plural "you" of the read-

---

is the 'Word of Life,' the special theme of the Gospel is the Word who reveals and imparts the Life; in the Epistle it is the Life revealed and imparted by the Word."

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Schnackenburg, p. 51.

<sup>2</sup>Wilder, "I, II and III John," p. 218. Brooke, p. 4, suggests that "emphasis is first laid on results, then on method . . . The witness is not only abiding, it is also satisfactory in kind." Westcott's (p. 6) limitation of "touched" to the resurrection (cf. Lk. 24:39) cannot be insisted upon for its reference is more to the incarnation in general or as a total event inclusive of the resurrection appearances. Cf. Schackenburg, p. 53.

<sup>3</sup>Dodd, The Johannine Epistles, p. 6.

<sup>4</sup>For a refutation of a purely mystical interpretation cf. Law, pp. 46-50.

<sup>5</sup>That this is not a literary device for the singular seems to be excluded by a similar use of the singular in 2:1, 7, 8, 12-14, 21, 26; 5:13.

ers, to that eye-witness experience is quite problematic. He may be referring to all Christians in view of their possession of the apostolic witness to Christ, whether those involved were original eye-witnesses or not.<sup>1</sup> Or if the author was himself an actual eye-witness and the impossibility is felt of there yet being alive at the date of writing<sup>2</sup> a circle of those who were eyewitnesses, it is suggested that the writer may be speaking from a collective prophetic self-consciousness in which the disciples of the writer through their close relationship to him belong to a circle of "apostolic" witnesses.<sup>3</sup> In the light of the recent trends of research as pointed up in the

---

<sup>1</sup>Wilder, "I, II and III John," p. 218. Dodd, The Johannine Epistles, pp. 9-16, seeks to find in the Old Testament sense of solidarity an explanation for the use of the personal pronouns in I John. He feels that there is no proof in verse one and two that the author was an eyewitness, but concludes: "Even if the language is that of an eyewitness, his 'we' is like the 'I' of the Psalms, which can stand both for the individual Psalmist and for the Israel of God. He speaks not exclusively for himself or for a restricted group, but for the whole Church to which the apostolic witness belongs by virtue of its koinōnia, over against the world which being outside the koinōnia has no knowledge of the Incarnate Son, and therefore no knowledge of the Real God. (vs. 20)." p. 16.

<sup>2</sup>The present tense of the proclamation (vss. 2-4) excludes a reference to the writer merely as a member of the original apostolic circle, many of whom were already deceased.

<sup>3</sup>Schnackenburg, p. 57. Cf. Haenchen, "Neuere Literatur Zu den Johannesbriefen," p. 14, who comments similarly that "der Verfasser spricht in den Anfangsworten im Stil einer prophetischen Offenbarung und verleiht damit seinem Anliegen das rechte Gewicht." He would not, however, see in the author an original eyewitness. This writer is convinced that the author came from some such circle which had a direct line to an original eyewitness tradition, whether he himself was such an eyewitness or not. Cf. particularly the articles of J. A. T. Robinson in his Twelve New Testament Studies, pp. 94-138; and A. M. Hunter, "Recent Trends in Johannine Studies," Expository Times LXXI (1959-1960), 164-167, 219-222. But note more recently the skepticism at these points of Reginald

introduction to the chapter, such is not beyond the range of possibility.

As pointed up in the distinct emphasis in verses one and two on the historical actuality of the hearing, seeing and touching, the incarnation is crucial in John's concept of the Son of God. This is evident from both the Gospel and the Epistle, although the perspective differs somewhat.<sup>1</sup> The Gospel, whose theme according to Bultmann is "the Word became flesh" (1:14),<sup>2</sup> starts from the historical humanity of Jesus and seeks to unveil his role as the revealer of the life of God. Although Jesus is obviously a man of flesh and blood, in a seeming paradox, his words and deeds bear witness to his divine role, an incarnate witness which is at once revelation and offense.<sup>3</sup> In the Epistle the writer begins with the reality of the revealed life of God in "the word of life" and identifies this revelation in a complete, permanent and personal manner with the human figure of Jesus. The concern is not so much the relation of the divine Father to the divine Son, but the relation of the divine Son to the historic Jesus.<sup>4</sup> The two complementary truths contained in the abstract of the Apostolic Gospel prefixed to the Epistle are, in Law's words, that Jesus is the "Word" in whom the Eternal Life of God

---

H. Fuller, The New Testament in Current Study, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1962), pp. 131f.

<sup>1</sup>Cf. W. F. Howard, Christianity According to St. John, p. 58.

<sup>2</sup>Rudolf Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, tr. Kendrick Grobel (London: SCM Press, 1955), II, 40.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid. Cf. pp. 49-49.

<sup>4</sup>Law, p. 99.



has been fully manifested, and that this manifestation has been made through a humanity in which there is nothing visionary or unreal, and is vouched for by every applicable test as genuine and complete. The Incarnate Word has been "seen," "heard," "handled."<sup>1</sup>

The difference in perspective is consistent with the respective evangelistic and pastoral concerns of the Gospel and Epistle. The revelation of divine life proclaimed on a historical foundation to unbelievers needs to have that foundation reaffirmed when its crucial significance in the faith of believers is endangered. His readers were faced with Gnostic denials that "Jesus is the Christ" (2:22), that "Jesus Christ has come in the flesh" (4:2; II Jn. 7) and that "Jesus is the Son of God" (4:15; 5:5; cf. 5:6-12).<sup>2</sup> In opposition to the "unmittelbaren 'Nach-Gott-Greifen' des Gnostikers"<sup>3</sup> John witnesses with all the explicitness and directness in his power to the "'Greifbar-Werden' des Ewig-Göttlichen in einer einmaligen menschlichen Gestalt."<sup>4</sup> For him the reality of Jesus' flesh and the divine character of the "word" concealed in it belong unconditionally together. The validity of the revelation of the life of God is at stake in the historical actuality of the incarnation.<sup>5</sup> The divine life which

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 91.

<sup>2</sup>Law, p. 92. For a recent discussion of the nature and affinities of the errors combated in the Epistle, cf. Schnackenburg, pp. 15-32.

<sup>3</sup>Schnackenburg, p. 58.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.

<sup>5</sup>This, according to Eduard Schweizer, was the danger inherent in the Johannine Church, that with its view of the church as living in the Son and he in it, it would detach itself from history. "The Concept of the Church in St. John," New Testament Essays, ed. J. B. Higgins (Manchester: The University Press, 1959), pp. 240-241. See further Nils Alstrup Dahl,

stands at the heart of the koinonia is that manifested in the incarnation, "Jesus Christ . . . come in the flesh" (4:2). The koinonia "with the Father" is identified as the koinonia "with his Son Jesus Christ" (1:3).

In John's presentation of Jesus as the sphere of the koinonia with God his most characteristic<sup>1</sup> designation of Jesus is that of "the Son of God" (Jn. 20:31, 1:18; I Jn. 5:13; 1:3, 7) which expresses the historical and qualitative uniqueness of his relation to the Father.<sup>2</sup> The two basic themes present in the "Son of God" concept according to Cullmann are obedience to the will of the Father and unity with him in revelatory action.<sup>3</sup> John particularly emphasizes the latter aspect for he always presents Jesus' unique<sup>4</sup> Sonship as an

---

"The Johannine Church and History," Current Issues In New Testament Interpretation ed. by W. Klassen and Grayden F. Snyder (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1962), pp. 124-142.

<sup>1</sup>W. F. Howard, Christianity According to St. John, p. 69. Cf. W. C. Van Unnik, "The Purpose of St. John's Gospel," who takes John 20:31 (cf 11:27) seriously insisting that "the purpose of the Fourth Gospel was to bring the visitors of a synagogue in the Diaspora (Jews and God fearers) to a belief in Jesus as the Messiah of Israel." p. 410. John's special concern according to Van Unnik was that Jesus was the Messiah as the Son of God. P. 404. That is, for John, even the title "Christ" finds its final definition in the designation "Son of God." In First John to deny that "Jesus is the Christ" (2:22) seems to be the same as denying that "Jesus is the Son of God" (4:15).

<sup>2</sup>Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, p. 275. For the background, Synoptic use, role in the early church, relation to the self-consciousness of Jesus as well as the role in Johannine thought of this title of pp. 270-279. Cf. also C. H. Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, 250-262.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 299.

<sup>4</sup>His stress on the uniqueness of the Son is evidenced by his use of μονογενής four times in the Gospel (1:14, 18; 3:16, 18) and once in the Epistle (4:9).

incomparable qualification for giving a full revelation of the Father.<sup>1</sup> This is in relation to the fact that the idea of revelation in divine redemptive action is stressed by John, at which point, according to Cullmann,

the concepts 'Son of God' and 'Logos' meet. In the Logos doctrine, Jesus' oneness with God is based entirely upon the Christ-event, above all on the life of Jesus reported in the Gospel. Similarly, the unity of the 'Son of God' with the Father is based on the fact, expressed also by Jesus himself, that he is the only and beloved Son just because he obediently fulfills the Father's commission for the world: 'I can do nothing on my own authority; . . . I seek not my own will but the will of the one who sent me' (John 5:30). A oneness of essence exists because there is complete oneness of will. 'My food is to do the will of the one who sent me, and to accomplish his work' (John 4:34). The picture is especially graphic: as the human body cannot live without nourishment, so it is Jesus' very nature that he must do what God does.<sup>2</sup>

Such is the unity that John has in view in the Epistle when he writes for example: "we have seen and testify that the Father has sent his Son as the Saviour of the world" (4:14). Thus in the opening words of the Epistle the significance of "the word of life," defined as "the eternal life which was with the Father (πρὸς τὸν πατέρα cf. Jn. 1:1-2) and was made manifest to us" (vs. 2), can be said to be comprehended in the "his Son" of verse three where the koinonia is stated to be equally and almost indistinguishably "with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ." As conceived in the mind of the writer the Father and the Son are so identified in relation to the life of the believer that it is often difficult to determine whether he is referring to God or to Christ by his frequent use of

<sup>1</sup>Howard, Christianity According to St. John, p. 70.

<sup>2</sup>Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, pp. 299-300.



αὐτοῦ (cf. 1:7; 3:23).<sup>1</sup> The same relation between the Father and the Son is indicated in John's verbal expressions ἐῖρα<sup>2</sup> ἐν and μένει<sup>2</sup> ἐν whose similarity of use in both Gospel and Epistle to that of the substantive κοινωρία in I John 1:3-7 has already been observed. In the Epistle the abiding is once both "in the Son and in the Father" (2:24), possibly once in the Son (2:6), but most often in God<sup>2</sup> (3:24) expressed in terms of mutual indwelling: "God abides in him, and he in God" (4:15; cf. 4:12, 13, 15).<sup>3</sup> In the Gospel the abiding or "being in" is mutual between the Christian and Christ (6:56; 15:4-7) and between the Father and the Son (14:10-11; 10:30). Moreover the two abidings are integral to each other: "I am in my Father, and you in me, and I in you" (14:20; cf. 6:56-57; 17:21). While the abiding of the Christian is expressed most frequently as being in the Son in the Gospel<sup>4</sup> as over against God in the Epistle, the difference is only in manner of expression in view of the stress in the Gospel on the unity of the life of the Father with that of the Son.<sup>5</sup> John reports Jesus as saying, "the living Father sent me, and

---

<sup>1</sup>Seesemann, p. 95.

<sup>2</sup>W. F. Howard, Christianity According to St. John, p. 58, has pointed out that the ratio of the occurrence of God to Father is 79 to 119 in the Gospel and 64 to 12 in the Epistle. This is consistent with the particular perspective and purpose of each writing.

<sup>3</sup>There is also more of an emphasis on abiding in the orthodox doctrine in the Epistle (1:8, 10, 2:4, 14, 24, 27). Cf. Eduard Schweizer, Church Order in the New Testament, tr. Frank Clarke (Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, 1961), p. 126.

<sup>4</sup>In 14:23 Jesus does say "we will come to him" and in 17:21 Jesus prays that "they also may be in us."

<sup>5</sup>The difference in expression can be accounted for by the fact that all such expressions are on the lips of Jesus in

I live because of the Father" (6:57; cf. 3:16; 10:30). In either Gospel or Epistle, to abide in and be indwelt by one is to abide in and be indwelt by the other because of the oneness of divine life between Father and Son, as is indeed the very point of the Johannine use of the terms.<sup>1</sup>

What can be termed the koinonia of the believer with the Son of God is dependent on the divine koinonia, the life-sharing of the Father and the Son. This is implicit in the opening verses of the Epistle and is explicitly stated in the Gospel: "He who eats my flesh and drinks my blood abides in me, and I in him. As the living Father sent me, and I live because of the Father, so he who eats me will live because of me" (6:56-57).<sup>2</sup> Similarly in 17:21 "that they may all be one; even as thou, Father, art in me and I in thee, that they also may be in us . . .". The relation of the Christian to God is conceived after the pattern of the relation of the Son to the Father. The Christian shares in that divine life which the Son shares with the Father. This relation is also expressed in terms of agapē: "As the Father has loved me, so have I loved you; abide in my love. If you keep my commandments, you will abide in my love, just as I have kept my Father's commandments and abide in his love" (15:9-10; cf. 5:19-20; 14:23). The nature and quality of the Christian's relation to

---

the Gospel and by its Christocentric perspective over against the Epistle which is more Theocentric. Cf. Law, p. 196.

<sup>1</sup>Cf. also John's use of "have" as applied to the believers relation to the Father and the Son, I Jn. 2:23, 5:12, II Jn. 9.

<sup>2</sup>For a detailed discussion of this passage, cf. Thornton, pp. 426ff.

God is grounded in the eternal relation (which is agapē) of the Father with the Son revealed to men in the historical career of Jesus.<sup>1</sup> Love, as Dodd stresses, is after all the only kind of union between persons that men can experience, so that is the most meaningful way John can find to express the nature of union with God.<sup>2</sup> To summarize then, at this point with Thornton:

There is therefore a descending scale of participation in the glory of the divine life, a scala communicationis. 'Before the world was' the Son shared, as he ever shares, the eternal glory of the Father (17:5). This is the divine koinonia from which proceeds forth the Paraclete, 'the Spirit of the truth' (15:26). When the Word became flesh, human nature as such was taken into the divine koinonia; and the divine-human life of the Son became the locus of the human koinonia. 'The glory of the only-begotten from the Father' became accessible to human eyewitnesses; and these in turn, became, through their participation in the divine koinonia, the nucleus of that human fellowship which is one aspect of the divine-human life (I John 1).<sup>3</sup>

Closely associated with the theme of the mutual abiding of the believer and God is the Christian's experience of the Holy Spirit. In the Epistle the possession of the Spirit is the evidence of such mutual abiding: "By this we know that we abide in him and he in us, because he has given us of his own Spirit" (4:13; cf. 3:24; 2:27). In the Gospel the coming of the Paraclete is evidence of the abiding of the Son in the Father as well as the mutual abiding of the Son and the Christian: "In that day<sup>4</sup> you will know that I am in my Father,

<sup>1</sup>Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, p. 262.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 199f.

<sup>3</sup>Thornton, p. 440.

<sup>4</sup>This is an eschatological phrase (Mk. 13:32) which refers to the resurrection and the new age of the Spirit which it inaugurates (so 16:23). Cf. Hoskyns, p. 460.



and you in me, and I in you" (14:20). From these references it is already evident with Schnackenburg that "für das joh. Denken stehen die Heilsfunktionen des Pneuma im Vordergrund."<sup>1</sup>

The Gospel in line with early Christian tradition presents Jesus as the one who will baptize with the Holy Spirit (1:33; 7:39; 20:22)<sup>2</sup> after his glorification.<sup>3</sup> But the incarnate ministry of Jesus is not so much ascribed to the working of the Spirit (as in the Synoptic Gospels) as it is asserted to be Spirit. "God is spirit" is the fundamental affirmation in this regard. The import (in contrast to  $\sigma\alpha\pi\varsigma$  cf. 6:63; 3:3-6; 4:23-24) is that the living, powerful and life-giving reality of God is manifested in the Son of God who in the flesh lived, died and rose again. Even Jesus' own words are spirit (6:63). All separation between God and Jesus is overcome by the Spirit for it is the Father himself, and not just a gift of the Father, which is encountered in Christ.<sup>4</sup> Thus Dodd concludes that "the gift of the Spirit to the Church is represented, not as if it were a separate outpouring of divine power under the forms of wind and fire (as in the Acts) but as the ultimate climax of the personal relations

---

<sup>1</sup>Schnackenburg, p. 209.

<sup>2</sup>Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, p. 22, points out that it is only when he is in immediate contact with the common tradition that he uses the current early Christian term  $\piνευμα \chi\gamma\iota\omicron\upsilon$  in the Gospel. He adds to the above 14:16-17.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Howard, Christianity According to St. John, pp. 73-74. C. K. Barrett, "The Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel," Journal of Theological Studies, I, New Series (1950), p. 5.

<sup>4</sup>Eduard Schweizer, Spirit of God, pp. 89-90.

between Jesus and His disciples" (20:22).<sup>1</sup>

The Holy Spirit as the reality of God in the incarnate ministry of Jesus is related to the experience of the Church after his glorification as the Paraclete.<sup>2</sup> The Holy Spirit as another Paraclete (14:15; 16:7; cf. I Jn. 2:1)<sup>3</sup> is most characteristically called "the Spirit of truth" (14:17; 15:26; 16:13) for the divine reality is present in him just as in him who said "I am . . . the truth"<sup>4</sup> (14:6). The work of the Paraclete is a ministry of revelation both succeeding and in continuity with that of Jesus (16:5-11; 14:25-26). His revelatory function, that of bearing witness to Jesus along with the disciples, rests upon the close relation with the Father from whom he proceeds and to the Son by whom he is sent (15:26).<sup>5</sup> The Paraclete, speaking not on his own authority (cf. 14:10), is to complete the incarnate revelation in the Son, bringing further to light his revelation in the flesh of the inmost nature and character of the Father (16:12-15). Thus for John the Holy Spirit as another Paraclete takes the place on the historical plane of the incarnate Jesus whose life

---

<sup>1</sup>Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, p. 227.

<sup>2</sup>The five Paraclete sayings are found in Jn. 14:15-17; 14:25-26; 15:26-27; 16:5-11; 16:12-15. For an excellent discussion of the significance of this designation cf. C. K. Barrett, "The Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel," pp. 8-14, who finds its background in the primitive apostolic preaching.

<sup>3</sup>In 14:25 the Paraclete is distinctly identified as the Holy Spirit:  $\delta \delta\epsilon \pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\kappa\lambda\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma, \tau\omicron \piνε\omicron\mu\alpha \tau\omicron \epsilon\gamma\gamma\omicron\gamma\epsilon\iota$ . Cf. n. one above.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, pp. 177f.

<sup>5</sup>In 14:15 cf. however, the expression "I will pray the Father, and he will give you another Counselor," and in 14:25 "the Counselor, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name."

continues on a higher plane. As the gift of the Heavenly Christ, actually dwelling in the company of believers and replacing the leadership of Jesus,<sup>1</sup> the Paraclete is the Spirit of the Christian witness to the Son of God. Barrett suggests that by definition "the Paraclete is the Spirit of the Christian paraclesis" for its use in the Gospel comes from the use of its cognates παρακλήσις and παρακαλέω in connection with the primitive apostolic preaching. So in the experience of the church the Holy Spirit is the power of God present in its proclamation, fulfilling the incarnate ministry of Jesus.<sup>2</sup>

The presentation of the Holy Spirit in the Epistle is in conformity with and seems to presuppose that of the Gospel.<sup>3</sup> The emphasis continues upon the Spirit as the Spirit of truth and as such is focused upon the particular error which endangers the readers (2: 20, 27; 4:1-3, 6; 5:6-8). The concern of the Epistle is more the reality of the incarnation as the mode of revelation than the reality of the revelation in the incarnation (as in the Gospel). The possession of the Spirit, however, is indispensably linked to a valid relation to God and to his Son in whom the Johannine koinonia is centered. The Holy Spirit is involved in the Johannine koinonia is primarily the power which enables men to perceive correctly and to experience with assurance the true revelation of God in Jesus Christ (I Jn. 4: 13; 3:24). The Holy Spirit is integrally bound up with the message

---

<sup>1</sup>Howard, Christianity According to St. John, p. 80. In relation to the whole paragraph, cf. pp. 75-80.

<sup>2</sup>Joseph Bonsirven, Épîtres de Saint Jean, Verbum Salutis, IX (Paris: Beauchesne et ses Fils, 1947-1954), p. 37.

<sup>3</sup>Barrett, "The Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel," pp. 12-14. Cf. Schweizer, The Spirit of God, p. 97.



which centers in Jesus as the Son of God. Almost interchangeably in I John "what you heard from the beginning" (2:24), "the anointing which you have received from him" (2:27; cf. 2:20) and "his Spirit" (4:13) are spoken of as abiding in him who correctly perceives Jesus as the Son of God; and thus knows that "we abide in him and he in us" (4:13). So supremely in John the Spirit is the Spirit of Truth bringing to men the true reality of the revelation of God in his Son. It is in such revelatory subordination to Jesus as the Son of God that the Holy Spirit is the object of the Johannine koinonia.

It is already apparent with Howard that the presence of the Holy Spirit in the Church was "more than the pledge and foretaste of the future kingdom."<sup>1</sup> The eschatology which was realized in the person of the incarnate Jesus as the Son of God<sup>2</sup> is realized in the Church's experience of the Paraclete. The emphasis is strong on the present actuality of salvation. He who has the Son of God has eternal life (I Jn. 5:12-13; cf. Jn. 3:14-16). Yet it is the "life in the coming age" (Jn. 12:25).<sup>3</sup> Not only is such life a reality in the life of the Church, it looks to a future consummation.<sup>4</sup> The expectation is "when he appears we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is" (I Jn. 3:3). It is of his departure and return that Jesus speaks in the farewell discourses, but the presence of the Paraclete sayings does not make necessarily for the identification of the return of

---

<sup>1</sup>Howard, Christianity According to St. John, p. 80.

<sup>2</sup>Barrett, "The Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel," p. 5.

<sup>3</sup>Howard, Christianity According to St. John, p. 109.

<sup>4</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 107-115. Here he demonstrates the presence of the element of futuristic eschatology in the Gospel.

Jesus with the gift of the Paraclete. The two concepts are complementary.<sup>1</sup> The revelation of God in his Son Jesus Christ which is eternal life, now the function of the Paraclete in relation to the departed incarnate Jesus, will reach its consummation with his personal return. Jesus, who as the Son of God is at the heart of the koinonia "with the Father," was incarnate in the flesh, is proclaimed and experienced in the church through the Holy Spirit, and is to come again (I Jn. 2:28).

Before exploring further the fundamental category of John's realized eschatology, eternal life, a look at the role of the cross in his presentation of the Son of God should be taken. The death of Jesus is set in direct relationship to the koinonia: "If we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship (*κοινωνία*) with one another, and the blood of Jesus his Son cleanses us from all sin." (I Jn. 1:7).<sup>2</sup> This is necessitated by the fact that the God who is revealed in the Son "is light and in him is no darkness at all" (I Jn. 1:5-6; cf. 2:8; Jn. 1:4-5, 9; 3:19; 9:5; 12:35, 36, 46).<sup>3</sup> The sin of man<sup>4</sup> has to be realistically dealt with if the koinonia is

<sup>1</sup>Cf. C. F. D. Moule, "The Individualism of the Fourth Gospel" Novum Testamentum V (July 1962), pp. 171-191 for the relation of futuristic and realized eschatology in the Johannine perspective.

<sup>2</sup>Dodd, The Johannine Epistles, p. xxxii f., suggests that the author is here keeping close to the primitive kerygma adding that "there is nothing that goes beyond the implications of the Isaianic prophecy" (Is. 53).

<sup>3</sup>On the significance of light cf. Bonsirven, pp. 84-88 and Law, pp. 56-66.

<sup>4</sup>For the Johannine perspective on sin cf. Vincent Taylor, The Atonement in New Testament Teaching, 3rd ed., (London: The Epworth Press, 1958), pp. 143-145.

to be realized "with one another" (I Jn. 1:7) as well as "with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ" (I Jn. 1:3). So Jesus the Son of God as "an advocate (παράκλητον)<sup>1</sup> with the Father" (I Jn. 2:1) is set forth as "the expiation (ἱλασμός) for our sins" (I Jn. 2:2; cf. 4:10), that is, as the one who removes the barrier between man and God occasioned by sin.<sup>2</sup> The emphasis is upon what the Son is now in virtue of his work as centered in the sacrifice of the cross. As indicated by the καὶ αὐτός the "advocate . . . is the expiation for our sins." As Schnackenburg observes, "Die Betrachtung geht rückläufig zu dem, was er einst zur Sühnung der Sündenschuld tat, was aber für allezeit bedeutungsvoll blieb."<sup>3</sup>

The perspective in the Gospel is similar, though not quite so explicit. Central to the work of Jesus is his suffering and death (Jn. 1:29; 3:14-16; 6:54-56; 10:11, 17f.; 12:34; 17:19).<sup>4</sup> This centrality is most distinctively viewed in the Gospel when it is realized that the death of Christ, far from being incidental to the fulfilment of the divine purpose, actually constitutes his glorifying

<sup>1</sup>The term paracletos has reference in this context to the heavenly intercession of Christ. Dodd, The Johannine Epistles, p. 24. Cf. Schnackenburg, pp. 90f.

<sup>2</sup>For the general significance of this term cf. Howard, Christianity According to St. John, pp. 99f. See further C. H. Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1985), pp. 82-95.

<sup>3</sup>Schnackenburg, p. 92. Cf. Taylor, The Atonement in New Testament Teaching, p. 152: "In the Johannine epigram: 'He is the ἱλασμός' the pronoun describes not only Christ in Himself, but Christ as He is found to be in the experience of the believer."

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, pp. 100, 70-73.



or exaltation, for "it is that through which and in which, He becomes the living Lord."<sup>1</sup> "The hour has come for the Son of man to be glorified. Truly, truly, I say to you, unless a grain of wheat falls into the earth and dies, it remains alone; but if it dies, it bears much fruit" (12:23b-24; cf. 3:14, 8:28; 12:32-33). The role of the cross in the work of Christ is vital for the perspective of both Gospel and Epistle. It is crucial for both that Jesus Christ came "with the water and the blood."<sup>2</sup> The peculiar significance, however, lies not primarily in looking back to what has happened, but in what the incarnate ministry climaxed in the cross has rendered the Son of God now to be in his relation to the believer. The Son of God in whom is revealed that "eternal life which was with the Father" (I Jn. 1:2), and as such is constitutive of the koinonia is now "the *ἡγιασμός* for our sins." The cleansing of I John 1:7 is there seen as an abiding factor in the koinonia (cf. 2:12). It can exist only as the stream of the sacrificial life of Jesus flows as a cleansing tide in the life of the believer removing guilt and purifying the conscience.<sup>3</sup>

Jesus' reference to his death by the analogy of the grain of wheat (Jn. 12:23-24) is followed by the saying, "he who loves his life loses it, and he who hates his life in this world will keep it for eternal life. If anyone serves me, he must follow me; and where I am,

---

<sup>1</sup>Taylor, The Atonement in New Testament Teaching, p. 147.

<sup>2</sup>For the reference of "blood" here to the crucifixion, cf. Schnackenburg, p. 257.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Thornton, pp. 163ff. who examines the implications of I John 1:5-2:2 for the Johannine koinonia in the light of Hebrews 9:11-14.

there shall my servant be also; if anyone serves me, the Father will honor him." (12:25-26).<sup>1</sup> With reference to the total saying (12:23-25) Eduard Schweizer<sup>2</sup> points out that not only is Jesus' death understood here in its significance as creating the community of the Church, but there is the additional suggestion that those who follow Jesus must share his destiny (cf. 21:18-19). Here is a hint of the koinonia of suffering which was so prominent in Paul's thinking. The perspective of John centers in the unity of the life of Christ and that of the Church (17:20-23). The continuity and identity between the two is such that the Johannine presentation of the ministry of Jesus is likewise his understanding of the mission of the Church. Through the presence in the church of the Paraclete the church will continue that ministry (14:12) at whose center lies the reality of the cross (17:18-19). For the Johannine koinonia of the cross the death of Christ furnishes the supreme example and central motif of the conduct of the Church: "love one another as I have loved you. Greater love has no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends" (15:12-13; cf. I Jn. 3:6). Further, as the church participates in the total ministry of Jesus it suffers the same persecution: "If the world hates you, know that it has hated me before it hated you. . . . Remember the word that I said to you, 'A servant is not greater than his master.' If they persecuted me, they will persecute you" (15:18, 20). This thought comes to more distinct expression in the Johannine circle of literature in a manner more akin to

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Mark 8:34-35.

<sup>2</sup>Lordship and Discipleship, pp. 85f.

Paul at Revelation 1:9: "I John, your brother, who share with you ( $\sigma\upsilon\chi\alpha\iota\nu\nu\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ )<sup>1</sup> in Jesus the tribulation and the kingdom and the patient endurance . . ." For John, as well as for Paul, there is a koinonia of the cross, not only in the sense of sharing in its benefits, but also in the determining of the actual character of Christian life and discipleship.

Jesus Christ the Son of God then is the focus of the Johanneine koinonia supremely as "the Revealer whom God has sent."<sup>2</sup> In him is the fullness of God for men: "grace and truth came through Jesus Christ. No one has ever seen God; the only Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he has made him known" (Jn. 1:17b-18). This is most vividly expressed in the Gospel by the great "I Am" statements: "I am the bread of life" (6:35; cf. 6:51), "I am the light of the world; he who follows me . . . will have the light of life" (8:12), "I am the door" (10:9; cf. vs. 10), "I am the good shepherd" (10:11, 14; cf. vs. 10), "I am the resurrection and the life" (11:25), "I am the way, and the truth and the life" (14:6), and "I am the true vine" (15:1).<sup>3</sup> The phrase is even used absolutely (8:24, 28; 13:19). All that God has for men is available to them in his Son, and that most supremely he catagorizes as life, eternal life (Jn. 1:4; I Jn. 1:1-2). So the koinonia can be viewed as "life in the Son" (I Jn. 5:11-13) from its divine perspective.

---

<sup>1</sup>See above p. 89.

<sup>2</sup>Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, II, p. 4.

<sup>3</sup>Bultmann feels that the phrase  $\epsilon\gamma\omega\epsilon\iota\mu\iota$  should normally be translated "It is I" in John. Ibid., p. 65.



Eternal Life.--To have koinonia "with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ" (I Jn. 1:3) not only involves a mutual abiding in the Father and the Son but also for John the abiding in the believer of all that has to do with the revelation of God in his Son to men. These include "the Spirit" (I Jn. 3:24; Jn. 14:17), "the anointing" (I Jn. 2:27), "the truth" (I Jn. 1:8; 2:4), "his word" (I Jn. 1:10, 2:14), "what you heard from the beginning" (2:24; cf. 5:10), "his seed" (I Jn. 3:9)<sup>1</sup> and "love" (I Jn. 4:12, 16; Jn. 17:26). The most definitive of such categories, however, is "eternal life" (I Jn. 3:15). This is the central theme<sup>2</sup> which John uses to convey what the believer has in the Son.<sup>3</sup> The essence of the koinonia was posited earlier in the chapter to be a life-sharing with the Father and the Son stemming from the manifestation in the Son of "the eternal life which was with the Father" (I Jn. 1:2). What John means by eternal life then is integral to his concept of the koinonia.

The Johannine as well as the New Testament use of  $\zeta\omega\eta$   $\alpha\iota\omega\nu\omicron\varsigma$  has its immediate background in the common rabbinic formula, the "life of the age to come,"<sup>4</sup> a life which is both qualitatively

<sup>1</sup>The RSV translates "God's nature."

<sup>2</sup>Hunter, Introducing New Testament Theology, p. 129, asserts that "St. John's key-word is life." Apart from the verb forms the noun "life" occurs thirty-six times in the Gospel and fourteen times in the Epistle. Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, p. 144, calls it "a major theme of the book."

<sup>3</sup>Note the relation of life to the I-am statements in the preceding paragraph.

<sup>4</sup>Hebrew,  $\text{חַיֵּי הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא}$ ; Aramaic,  $\text{חַיֵּי דְּהַא עָלְמָא הַבָּא}$ ; Simon, p. 97. For the total background of the term 'life' and the phrase 'eternal life' cf. Gerhard von Rad, George Bertram, and Rudolf. Bultmann,  $\text{ζωή, ἡ ζωή, ἡ ζωὴ}$ ,

and quantitatively different from this life.<sup>1</sup> The reference is properly to life in the Messianic Age which is to come. In the Synoptic Gospels the term is equivalent to "the kingdom of God" (cf. Mk. 10: 17-31) which, though a future blessing, is present in the person and ministry of Jesus.<sup>2</sup> Similarly in John's Gospel the phrase "kingdom of God", occurring only in 3:3, 5, is made equivalent to "eternal life" (3:15-16). In Johannine language "eternal life" supplants the Synoptic "kingdom of God." John can use the term in the futuristic sense (5:39; 6:7; 12:25; cf. 5:29), but more often it carries a qualitative emphasis upon life in the present (5:24; 6:54; 11:23-26). The two conceptions merge in the living Christ. The assertion "for as the Father has life in himself, so he has granted the Son also to have life in himself," (5:26) spans the gap between references to a present bringing to life (5:25) and to the future resurrection (5:27-29). The promise of Jesus to his disciples before his departure was "because I live, you shall live also" (14:19). It is life from the glorified Son,<sup>3</sup> the life of him who has conquered death: "I am the resurrection and the life" (11:25; cf. 14:6).<sup>4</sup> Although eternal life

---

ζωον, ζωογονεῖν, ζωονοίω", Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. Gerhard Kittel (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1935), II, 833-877; Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, pp. 144-150.

<sup>1</sup>Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, p. 147.

<sup>2</sup>See above pp. 165ff. in Chapter IV.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. A. Feuillet, "La Participation actuelle à la vie divine d'après le quatrième évangile. Les origines et le sens de cette conception," Studia Evangelica, ed. K. Aland, F. L. Cross, J. Daniélou, H. Riesenfeld and W. C. van Unnik (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1959), pp. 295-308.

<sup>4</sup>Simon, p. 104, observes that "John releases the believers

brings the reality of God's new age to the believer in the present, it is never a state or quality of life apart from the exalted Lord.<sup>1</sup>

So explicitly in I John eternal life is the gift of God in his Son: "this is the testimony, that God gave us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He who has the Son has life; he who has not the Son has not life" (I Jn. 5:11-12). It is not merely something which the Son gives, it is to have the Son, to be "in him who is true, in his Son Jesus Christ." "This," John continues, "is the true God and eternal life" (I Jn. 5:20). To be in valid response to God in the Son is to be partaking of the life of God in the Son, which in Johannine language is eternal life. "This actual impartation of the actual life of God," concludes Law, "is the core of Johannine soteriology."<sup>2</sup>

The role of revelational response to the Son in the possession of eternal life is indicated by the latter's dependence on the knowing of the Son and in him the Father: "And we know that the Son of God has come and has given us understanding, to know him who is true; and we are in him who is true, in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life" (I Jn. 5:20). Similarly in the Gospel Jesus prays, "and this is eternal life, that they may know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent" (17:3). Knowing

---

from a purely apocalyptic concept of life because of his interpretation of Jesus. Since Christ is the exalted Lord it would be absurd for his people merely to wait for life in Heaven. On the contrary, Christians 'have passed out of death into life' (v. 24; I John 3:14) because Jesus also triumphed over death and imparts his life to them."

<sup>1</sup>Ibid.

<sup>2</sup>Law, p. 56.



involves in John both the understanding of the intellect and the obedience of the will.<sup>1</sup> It is a knowledge of personal relationship. Further, as is evidenced in the verses just quoted, the knowledge of God "takes the form of a knowledge of Christ, or is dependent upon a knowledge of Christ."<sup>2</sup> A relation of full mutual knowledge exists only between the Father and the Son (John 10:14-15; 7:28-29; 8:54-55). The nature of God is only truly apprehended in the unity of Father and Son (Jn. 10:38). Finally, the concept of knowledge in John is extended to include the comprehension of the mutual indwelling of man and God (Jn. 14:20). Valid experience or knowledge of God is made possible through the recognition of Christ as the revelation of God and inseparably one with God; and finds its completion in man's experience of unity with Christ in God. So as Dodd points out the distinction between being in Christ and knowing that we are in Christ is hardly more than a formal one.<sup>3</sup>

The knowledge of God in his Son as inherent in and practically equivalent to eternal life and thus to the koinonia quality of life (cf. I Jn. 2:3-4) of which the Son of God is the object and subject<sup>4</sup> is inseparable from belief (cf. Jn. 6:69). This language, very frequent in John,<sup>5</sup> expresses particularly in the unique phrase πιστεύω

<sup>1</sup>For a discussion of the background and significance of γῶσις in John cf. Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, pp. 151-169.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 169.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

<sup>4</sup>Vincent Taylor, The Person of Christ in New Testament Teaching (London: Macmillan and Co., 1959), p. 100.

<sup>5</sup>The verb πιστεύειν which he prefers to the noun πίστις

εἰς εἰς (Jn. 1:12; 7:5; 14:1; I Jn. 5:10, 12)<sup>1</sup> the recognition of and the placing of personal trust in Jesus as the revelation of God.<sup>2</sup> The integral relation of both the concepts of knowledge and belief to eternal life indicates that it is appropriated by the response of the total person to the Son, that is, to the totality of his person as incarnate, crucified, glorified and made known by the Paraclete. Eternal life can thus be defined in terms of a personal relationship to the Son as the revealer of the Father, a relationship which in Johannine terms is more precisely "life in the Son" (I Jn. 5:12). John made use of the term eternal life which was current in his own religious heritage and environment to present the salvation significance of Jesus Christ, and his interpretative category was in turn supremely filled and reinterpreted by the Son himself.

This "life in the Son" as John defines the Christian koinonia from its divine perspective is presented also in terms of regeneration. In I John 3:1 John writes: "See what love the Father has given us, that we should be called children of God; and so we are." The very language which John uses, τεκνία,<sup>3</sup> is close to the idea of regeneration.<sup>4</sup> In neither Gospel or Epistle is οἶος used for Chris-

---

(only at I Jn. 5:4) occurs 100 times in the Gospel and ten times in the Epistle.

<sup>1</sup>A characteristic Johannine phrase for 37 out of a total of 45 are in the entire New Testament are in John.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, pp. 183ff.

<sup>3</sup>His favorite terms when addressing his readers interestingly is τεκνία (I Jn. 2:1, 12, 28; 3:7, 18; 4:4; 5:21, cf. John 13:33 where it is found on Jesus' lips.)

<sup>4</sup>The word implies community of character with the Father through likeness to the Son." Thornton, p. 164.

tians as in Paul (Rom. 8:14) but is reserved for Christ. In I John 2:29-3:10 the phrase "children of God" (vss. 1, 2, 10) is used synonymously with the phrase "born (γενένηται) of God" (2:29; 3:9) with which the theme of the passage is introduced in 2:29 (cf. the phrase σπέρμα αὐτοῦ in 3:9 and 5:1-2).<sup>1</sup> So in the Gospel those who were given the "power to become children of God" (1:12) are said to be "born . . . of God" (1:13). The concept becomes further explicit in Jesus' presentation of the birth by the Spirit at 3:3-8 where such is said to be indispensable to participation in the kingdom of God (3:3,5) and thus to eternal life (3:15-16 cf. I Jn. 3:14-16 in relation to what precedes.)

To be "born of God" from the perspective of the experience of the Church is more precisely to be "born of the Spirit." The Spirit as the vehicle of life is the medium of rebirth.<sup>2</sup> Spirit as the category of the reality of the activity of God in the life and work of the incarnate Jesus climaxed in his death and exaltation (3:13-16)<sup>3</sup> is experientially realized in the church by the Holy Spirit,<sup>4</sup> the Paraclete.<sup>5</sup> Thus it is ultimately the life of the glorified Son

---

<sup>1</sup>Schnackenburg, p. 175.

<sup>2</sup>Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, p. 224.

<sup>3</sup>For the relation of the birth of the Spirit to the crucifixion and exaltation of Jesus in John 3:1-16 cf. Oscar Cullmann, Early Christian Worship, tr. A. S. Todd and J. B. Torrance (London: SCM Press, 1953).

<sup>4</sup>The linking of "water" and "Spirit" is possibly a reference to John's baptism as fulfilled in Christian baptism which in the New Testament is usually connected closely with the Holy Spirit. Cf. C. K. Barrett, The Gospel According to St. John, p. 174.

<sup>5</sup>See above pp. 368-371.



of God which effects the new birth and which constitutes those who believe in him (Jn. 1:12; I Jn. 5:1) "children of God." Eternal life is life realized in the eschatological realm of the Spirit (i.e., the kingdom of God): "that which is born of the Spirit is spirit" (3:6). It is life now<sup>1</sup> as "children of God."<sup>2</sup> But the term τέκνα itself has the prospect of future development:<sup>3</sup> "Beloved we are God's children now; it does not yet appear what we shall be, but we know that when he appears we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is" (3:2). To be "God's children" holds the promise of a completed likeness at the parousia (2:28; cf. Jn. 5:29; 6:39, 40, 44, 54). Once again it is seen that while John's stress is on the present qualitative reality of the "life in the Son" which stands at the heart of the koinonia, it is never divorced from a futuristic perspective. Eternal life will have its quantitative fulfilment as well as its qualitative perfection.

From the point of view of its realization, the divine perspective of the Johannine koinonia is the possession of eternal life. This life is in essence life in the Son of God who in the totality of his person and work is the supreme revelation of the Father to men. This sharing in the divine life is possible only in closest personal relation to the Son, a relation which is often spoken of as a mutual abiding of the believer and the Son of God as the true vine (Jn. 15:1-5, cf. I Jn. 2:5,6). By abiding in the vine, the branch partakes

---

<sup>1</sup>Schnackenburg, p. 177.

<sup>2</sup>In I John 3:1-2 both occurrences of τέκνα are anarthrous with the possibility of a qualitative emphasis.

<sup>3</sup>Westcott, The Epistles of St. John, p. 96.

of its life; the life of the true vine by believing in and depending on Jesus as the Christ, the Son of God, and thus is indwelt by him who is "the life" (Jn. 11:25; 14:6). The Christian's life as such is the life of God in his Son, eternal life. This is perhaps the basic figure that stands behind the whole concept of life-sharing with the Father and the Son which comes to comprehensive expression in I John 1:3. Both the reality and the intimacy of this personal relation to God in his Son is stressed as it is further expressed in terms of a progressive "knowing" of "the only true God and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." (Jn. 17:3; cf. I Jn. 5:20; 2:3, 4, 12). This most personal relationship to God in his Son (cf. Jn. 13:23) which is the divine perspective of the common life is brought to realization in the individual<sup>1</sup> lives of believers by the Spirit of Truth, the Paraclete, whose function is to fulfil the revelatory role of the Son of God (Jn. 16:12-15) until his personal return.

#### The Common Life: The Corporate Ethic

As one relationship.---In conformity with the established use of the term koinonia to denote of participating together in something is John's stress by its use that the believer's relation to God and his relation to his neighbour is basically one inseparable relationship. In I John 1:3 he identifies the koinonia which is to be mu-

---

<sup>1</sup>C. F. D. Moule, "The Individualism of the Fourth Gospel," p. 182, concludes that "the Fourth Evangelist's eschatology is much more 'normal' than is often assumed; and that, where it is of an emphatically realized type, there the individualistic tendency of this Gospel is also at its most prominent; and that the peculiar depth of the Fourth Gospel lies largely in its penetrating analysis of the meaning of individual relations with God in Christ."

tually possessed as that "sharing-together quality of life" which is "with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ." Or as Seesemann puts it: "Fundament der Gemeinschaft des Verfassers und der Adressaten ist die Gemeinschaft des Verfassers mit Gott und Christus."<sup>1</sup> The same oneness of relationship is evident from the development of thought in verses six and seven. There koinonia "with one another,"<sup>2</sup> its possibility explained<sup>3</sup> by the fact that "the blood of Jesus his Son cleanses us from all sin," is integrally bound up with the ethical implications of koinonia in relation to God. John by his use of koinonia in these verses is concerned with defining the essential nature of the relation between Christians as he sets the stage for his more practical dealing with the problem.

The relation between Christians is determined by their common relation to God in his Son. Thus all that has been posited about the divine perspective of the common life, focused as eternal life (the life of God) revealed and imparted to men in Jesus Christ as the Son of God resulting through the activity of the Spirit in a relation of sonship to God, can be said to be the essence of the common life of believers.<sup>4</sup> The life of God shared with men in their relation to his Son constitutes the very nature of the relation between Christians

---

<sup>1</sup>Seesemann, p. 98.

<sup>2</sup>For the preference of the reading ἀλλήλων to αὐτοῦ see above, p. 97, n. 2.

<sup>3</sup>Hauck, pp. 19-21, suggests that in verses 6-10, the third strophe gives the explanation. Strophes one and two give the condition and consequence respectively.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Bonsirven, pp. 39-41.



and determines the character of their actions and attitudes towards one another.<sup>1</sup>

This nature of the koinonia is brought to full expression likewise in John 17:21: "That they may all be one; even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us, so that the world may believe that thou hast sent me" (cf. vs. 10). The unity of Christians is in their mutual abiding in the Father and the Son and as such is the unity of the Father and the Son in their mutual abiding. In this Gospel which so stresses the unity of the Church, indicating that it had become a problem by the time of writing, the unity of the Church is that of the vine itself.<sup>2</sup> It was a oneness that already existed in Christ, but a oneness that must be outwardly manifested if the Church is to bear witness to the Son and thus become the revelation of God to the world.<sup>3</sup> So this oneness of believers, like their common relation to the Father and the Son which is dependent on the mutual abiding of the latter,<sup>4</sup> is conceived in concrete personal terms of agapē: "If you keep my commandments, you will abide in my love, just as I have kept my Father's commandments and abide in his love. This is my commandment, that you love one another as I have loved you" (Jn. 15:10, 12, cf. 9, 17).

John arrives at the same agapē-ethic in I John 1:5-2:11. The koinonia "with one another" (1:7) is also with God (1:6). Since "God

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Dodd, The Johannine Epistles, pp. 7-8.

<sup>2</sup>E. Schweizer, "The Concept of the Church in St. John", p. 236.

<sup>3</sup>E. Schweizer, Church Order in the New Testament, p. 123.

<sup>4</sup>See above, pp. 365-368.

is light"<sup>1</sup> (1:5) one must "walk in the light as he is in the light" (1:7) in order to be rightly related to one's Christian brother. "Light" is symbolical of the self-revelation of God in his Son, "first," according to Law, "as a necessity that belongs to His moral nature; secondly, as the source of all moral illumination."<sup>2</sup> So God as light confronted with the reality of sin is "the blood of Jesus his Son" (1:7) which cleanses from all sin. This general statement is more distinctly defined both in method and result in verse nine: "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just, and will forgive our sins and cleanse us from all unrighteousness." Then he goes on to make its application to anticipated situations in daily life: "I am writing this to you so that you may not sin; but if any one does sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; and he is the expiation for our sins . . ." (2:1-2a). Cleansing from sin is indispensable to the Johannine koinonia, a cleansing that is only possible as "God is Light" in the self-sacrifice of his Son for the "sins of the whole world."<sup>3</sup>

Under the theme that "God is light" the validity of the koinonia is predicated second on the keeping of God's commandments: "And by this we may be sure that we know him, if we keep his commandments" (2:3). The knowing of God, the perfecting of the love of God<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Schnackenburg, p. 76, rightly points out that this phrase "steht als Kern-und Leitgedanke "uber dem ganzen Hauptteil."

<sup>2</sup>Law, p. 58. Cf. Jn. 12:34-36.

<sup>3</sup>See above, pp. 374ff. for a discussion of John 2:1-2.

<sup>4</sup>The genitive  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$  is qualitative. Schnackenburg, p. 103. Cf. Westcott, The Epistles of St. John, pp. 48-49.

is based on such a keeping of God's word (2:5). This he points up in terms of Jesus Christ as the supreme revelation of the moral or ethical character of God: "By this we may be sure that we are in him: he who says he abides in him ought to walk in the same way in which he<sup>1</sup> walked" (2:5b-6). The ethical character of the koinonia is that of Jesus himself (cf. 2:29, 3:3, 5; 4:12). This ethic, in line with the note already struck in verse five, John expresses as he moves on to his practical problem, in concrete terms of agapē: "He who loves his brother abides in the light . . ." (2:10a). The continuity is distinct with "if we walk in the light, we have fellowship (koinonia) with one another . . ." (1:7). The ethical concern of the koinonia quality of life, which in its divine and human aspects is fundamentally one mutually gratifying relationship, is a relation of love.

A love-relationship.--The corporate ethic of the Johannine common life comes to its ultimate expression in the Gospel as the new commandment (13:34; cf. 15:12, 17) and as the perfection of the love of God in the Epistle (2:5; 4:12, 17-18). The commandment of love to the brethren which John sets before his readers "with magnificent monotony"<sup>2</sup> is viewed in both Gospel and Epistles as the one commandment inclusive of all others (Jn. 15:10-12; I Jn. 3:10-11).<sup>3</sup> All

---

<sup>1</sup> ἐκεῖνος in distinction to the more frequent αὐτός refers emphatically to Jesus Christ as known in the incarnation. Cf. 3:3, 5, 7, 16; 4:17; Schnackenburg, p. 75, Dodd, The Johannine Epistles, p. 32.

<sup>2</sup>Quell and Stauffer, p. 63.

<sup>3</sup>Edwin Kenneth Lee, The Religious Thought of St. John (London: S. P. C. K., 1950), pp. 245-246.



other commandments "are practical applications of the one Divine Law to the outstanding facts and situations of human life."<sup>1</sup>

The love which is supremely to characterize the inter-personal relationships of the koinonia is inseparable from the revelation of the love of God in his Son Jesus Christ. The "newness" of Jesus' commandment to love, as Schrenk emphasizes,

besteht nicht im Gebot der Liebe überhaupt oder in einem neuen Grad des Liebens, sondern in der neuartigen christologischen Verwurzelung: als die von Jesus Geliebten sollen sie sich untereinander lieben. Sie haben Jesu grundlegendes Lieben zu verwirklichen. So wird das liebende Geben Jesu selbst Grund und Kraft des neuen ἀγαπᾶν.<sup>2</sup>

The new commandment is embodied in the person of Jesus: "this is my commandment, that you love one another as I have loved you. Greater love has no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends. You are my friends if you do what I command you" (Jn. 15: 12-14, cf. 13:34). Here, according to Barrett, "the whole ministry of Jesus, including his glorification in death, is summed up as the service of love to those who by it are redeemed; every Christian owes the same service of love to every other."<sup>3</sup> This was graphically illustrated by Jesus in the footwashing episode which preceded the giving of the new commandment (13:1ff.): "Jesus . . . having loved his own who were in the world, he loved them to the end." This act which he was about to perform, an act which prefigured and interp-

---

<sup>1</sup>Law, p. 212.

<sup>2</sup>Gottlob Schrenk, "ἐν τέλλουσι, ἐν τοῦ λή", "Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. Gerhard Kittel (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1935), II, 550. C. K. Barrett, The Gospel According to St. John, p. 377, for Jewish precedents to the commandment of love.

<sup>3</sup>Barrett, The Gospel According to St. John, p. 397.

reted his death on the cross, is given as the meaning of agapē and thus as the pattern (vs. 15) of their exercise of love to one another.<sup>1</sup>

The introduction of the new commandment in John's Gospel at the point in the narrative where the Lord's Supper and the instituting of the new covenant occurs in the Synoptics suggests that it is "the New Law for the New Covenant."<sup>2</sup> Dewar writes:

When Christ spoke of the New Commandment, it is impossible not to suppose that he had in mind Jeremiah's New Covenant and new laws (νόμους) which God would put into the minds of His people and write in their hearts. The first commandment was external: this is internal. That is the essence of agapē. . . . It cannot be expressed by conformity to any outward precepts which could possibly be devised. It must come from within outwards. That is why the New Commandment, "Thou shalt show agapē to thy neighbor as thyself", found in Leviticus, is, although formally correct, of little avail. In order that it may have force, two requirements are necessary. First, what it means must be illustrated in practice by a concrete example. Secondly, the power and inspiration to follow this example must be supplied. Our Lord's commandment is 'new' because it fulfills both of these requirements, which the Law of Moses lacked.<sup>3</sup>

Jesus' sacrifice as institutive of the new covenant furnishes both the example and the motive power for the Christian's mutual exercise of agapē. As they share in the life released by that sacrifice, the agapē of God is imparted to them which they can in turn manifest to one another. Thus it is the new law of love which is written on the hearts of the people of the New covenant.

The inter-Christian ethic is a union of love, rooted in the mutual love of the Father and the Son (cf. Jn. 15:9-10)<sup>4</sup> and bound up

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Lindsay Dewar, An Outline of New Testament Ethics (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1949), pp. 191-192.

<sup>2</sup>Lee, p. 247.

<sup>3</sup>Dewar, pp. 193-194.

<sup>4</sup>See above pp. 367-368.

with the mission and message of God's love to men.<sup>1</sup> "Love is, as it were, the bond of existence within the unity of Father, Son, and believers."<sup>2</sup> It is in this context that Dodd concludes:

It is by becoming first the objects of this love, and then in turn the subjects of the same love, directed towards Christ and towards one another, that we become one by mutual indwelling both with Father and Son and with one another in Him.<sup>3</sup>

The mutual love of the disciples is to be like that of the Father and the Son which they have come to experience in the Son's laying down of his life for them as his friends. Not only does the imperative rise out of the indicative, it is supremely qualified by the indicative.<sup>4</sup>

The same inner unity between indicative and imperative, between Gospel and ethic, lies at the heart of the Epistle. By the very opening verses of the Epistle the reality of the incarnation is linked with the moral and spiritual life of the Christian koinonia.<sup>5</sup> The "thorough integration of the Commandment and the Gospel,"<sup>6</sup> as implicit in the very use of the term koinonia, is the fundamental motif and outstanding characteristic of the First Epistle. To have stated this inseparable unity "with the utmost clearness and emphasis," writes Dodd, "is a distinctive service to Christian thought."<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Howard, Christianity According to St. John, p. 169.

<sup>2</sup>Barrett, The Gospel According to St. John, p. 397.

<sup>3</sup>Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, p. 197.

<sup>4</sup>Bultmann, The Theology of the New Testament, II, 80-81.

<sup>5</sup>Dewar, p. 201.

<sup>6</sup>Dodd, The Johannine Epistles, p. xxxi.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid.



As in the Gospel God's love is life's ultimate reality for the circle which consists of the Father and the Son and those who belong to him. To abide in his love by the exercise of brotherly love is the law of its life: "He who does not love remains in death" (3:14). Often John speaks only of loving in the absolute sense<sup>1</sup> indicating that for him "this love is a movement of life, a form of existence, a realization of God in this world."<sup>2</sup>

John develops the essential oneness of love for one's brother with the essence of the koinonia as a life sharing (cf. 2:10)<sup>3</sup> in terms of the Christian's status as "children of God" (2:29-5:5). Such exercise of love is both an evidence and an indispensable correlate of being born of God: "Beloved, let us love one another; for love is of God, and he who loves is born of God and knows God" (4:7). The discussion which leads up to this assertion begins with the general ethical concern of righteousness as embodied in Christ: "If you know that he is righteous, you may be sure that every one who does right is born of him" (2:29). The meaning of his readers' privilege as recipients of God's love, and thus as children of God (3:1-3),<sup>4</sup> is shown to be incompatible with sin, which in turn is seen primarily as the lack of love (3:4-10). Love for the brethren is then stressed as indispensable, for supremely in it is found the assurance of eternal life (3:11-15; cf. vss. 19-24). This love, John continues, is known

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. 3:18; 4:7f.; 4:19.

<sup>2</sup>Quell and Stauffer, pp. 62-63.

<sup>3</sup>See the discussion on 1:5-11, above pp.

<sup>4</sup>See above p. 384.

"by this . . . that he ( $\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\varsigma$ )<sup>1</sup> laid down his life for us; and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren" (3:16). The obligation of love, lying in the perception of the relation in which they stand to one another and to Christ,<sup>2</sup> is exceedingly practical: "But if any one has the world's goods and sees his brother in need, yet closes his heart against him, how does God's love abide in him?" (3:17). The reality of being children of God is predicated upon the exercise of a love which both finds its dynamic from and partakes of the quality of the love that was manifest in the cross of Christ. It is thus he exhorts: "let us not love in word or speech but in deed and in truth" (3:18).

This is the conception that rises to the zenith of its expression in 4:7-12 which concludes with the perfection of love. With the thought "born of God" the ultimate connection is made in that "love is of God" (vs. 7) or more direct "God is love" (vs. 8). But to define what he means by the assertion that "God is love" John can only turn again to the act of God in his Son Jesus Christ: "In this the love of God was made manifest among us, that God sent his only Son into the world, so that we might live through him" (vs. 9; cf. vs. 10). God's love experienced in Jesus Christ is the source of the Christian life. And this life when lived out in relation to others results in brotherly love. Not only is the fact they have been loved a motive for such, but their experience of God's love in Christ has

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. 2:6, 3:3, 5, 7; 4:17. See above p. 389, n. 1.

<sup>2</sup>Westcott, The Epistles of St. John, p. 114: "St. John regards the duty as included in the knowledge (and we ought) and not as logically deduced from it (wherefore we ought)."

so constituted the quality of their lives that by the very nature of what they are, love is manifest by them to others. If it does not, they are counterfeit.

When this takes place God's love is perfected in the society of believers (vs. 12). The Christian becomes a secondary sign of God's love,<sup>1</sup> the medium by which it reaches into the lives of his fellows. As the Christian realizes constantly afresh in his daily life the personal love God has to him he is able to radiate to others the love which he has and is receiving as he personally loves them.<sup>2</sup> God's love is fulfilling its intended purpose, it is reaching its goal when its reception by those who put their trust in Christ as come in the flesh makes its way through the very character of their lives to others. Perfect love is thus more an effective than a qualitative perfection.<sup>3</sup>

When it thus achieves its end in this manner one is assured of his status as born of God. One's relation to God is proved even to oneself primarily by the quality of one's relation to men. Such is the whole point of John's use of the idea of perfect love in the paragraph that follows:

In this is love perfected with us, that we may have con-

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid. 149: "The Christian shares the life of Christ, and so becomes himself a secondary sign of God's love."

<sup>2</sup>E. Schweizer, "The Concept of the Church in St. John," p. 242.

<sup>3</sup>Law, p. 286ff: "The assertion of perfectness refers, not to the strength or purity of Love as a sentiment, but solely to its bearing fruit in deeds which prove its reality and fulfil its purpose. The idea is that, not of qualitative, but of effective perfection."



fidence for the day of judgment, because as he is so are we in this world. There is no fear in love, but perfect love casts out fear. For fear has to do with punishment, and he who fears is not perfected in love. (4:17-18).

The focus, it should be noted, is again upon Christ himself as the ethic of the koinonia. In the ultimate context of love it is "as he ( $\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\varsigma$ ) is so are we in this world." In Christ love had its absolute fulfilment as he sought by all he did and suffered to make Himself the channel through which the love of God might reach men. And as the Christian becomes the channel through which the Love of God reaches his fellow-men, then in a degree he is "as he is" and love has reached its fulfilment in him, that he "may have boldness in the day of judgment. Love will be on the Judgment-seat. Love will be before the judgment seat. And Love cannot be condemned or dis-owned of love."<sup>1</sup>

The koinonia is truly one relationship, a fusion of religion and ethic in concrete personal terms of love: "we love, because he first loved us. If anyone says, 'I love God,' and hates his brother, he is a liar; for he who does not love his brother whom he has seen cannot love God whom he has not seen" (4:19-20). God as invisible cannot himself be the direct object of the practical expression of love. "We cannot," suggests Law, "love God after the same fashion in which He has loved us."<sup>2</sup> Yet the same nature of love abides in the Christian that was manifest toward him in Christ. Its proper expression then is toward others: "No man has ever seen God: if we love one another, God abides in us and his love is perfected in us"

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 288.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 250.

(4:12). The Christian is only true to God's love and, insofar as it is possible within the Johannine concept of love, only loves God as he loves his brother. The "his love is perfected in us" of 4:12 is parallel to the "let us not love in word or speech but in deed and in truth" of 3:18.<sup>1</sup>

This inseparable relation between religious experience and morality here developed in terms of agapē is implicit in John's use of koinonia in the opening verses of the Epistle. By it he was asserting the oneness of man's saving relation with God with his ethical relation to man which he proceeded to unfold in differing terminologies throughout the Epistle. The exercise of brotherly love is the test of the reality and validity of the koinonia expressed as walking in the light (2:7-11), as being children of God (2:29-3:24) and as union with God (4:7-21). Religion and ethics are for him one life, eternal life in the Son, grounded ultimately in what Dodd calls the "author's outstanding contribution to Christian theology,"<sup>2</sup> the realization that "God is love" (4:8, 16). The koinonia is a common life, the life of him whose nature is love. This love is known supremely in the self-sacrifice of Jesus Christ for the sins of men and experienced in a faith-relationship to him as the Son of God. The love-quality of such

---

<sup>1</sup>See above p. 394.

<sup>2</sup>Dodd, The Johannine Epistles, p. xlvii: "Starting without any aim at dogmatic definition, the author of the epistle has found himself led, through reflection upon the content of the tradition and of Christian experience, to formulate the most profound, as well as the simplest, summing up of the Christian revelation of God: a maxim which, once enunciated, becomes the touchstone of Christian faith and life, and a signpost to the direction which must be taken by all sound theological thinking."

a personal relationship to God by nature of the life that is now shared is also the love-quality of all other personal relationships. The koinonia is a mutual share in and manifesting of that life whose highest conception is agapē.

In passing, the role of love towards non-Christians should be noted. John's emphasis is on love for the brethren because of the position of the Johannine church in the midst of a pagan and often hostile world.<sup>1</sup> The love, however, about which he was concerned was always the love of him who loved the world (Jn. 3:16, I Jn. 2:2). Its exercise in the new commandment among those who were its recipients was to the end that "all men will know that you are my disciples" (13:35). Following the discourse on the vine and the branches (15:1-17) Jesus' concern for the disciples abiding in love by loving one another was that they should "go and bear fruit" (15:16; cf. vs. 8). They were to love one another in order that God's love might radiate through them and touch the world.<sup>2</sup> God's love was to be revealed to the world as they saw its manifestation of the society of believers. Thus Westcott comments on I John 4:7 that "John deals with the love of Christians for Christians as the absolute type of love."<sup>3</sup> Lessons of love were to be learned in the church which could be

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Hugh Montefiore, "Thou shalt love thy Neighbor as Thyself," Novum Testamentum, V (July 1962), p. 169. He feels that John has radically transformed Jesus' teaching on love for the neighbor. He traces the change as taking place also in the writings of James, Peter and Paul but culminating in John. Cf. Dodd, The Johannine Epistles, pp. xlv-xlvi.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Schweizer, "The Concept of the Church in St. John," p. 242.

<sup>3</sup>Westcott, The Epistles of St. John, p. 147.



applied in the wider sphere of human relations.<sup>1</sup>

Although the predominant emphasis has shifted from love for one's enemies in the teaching of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels to love for the brethren in the Johannine literature, the conception of koinonia has not been essentially altered. The difference in the most part can be accounted for by the needs of the particular situation of the Johannine church. For this reason the matter of a positive ethic toward those without the church is not an integral part of John's concern. The koinonia as portrayed in the Johannine literature centers in the person of Christ, the common relation of men to him, and the quality of their relation to one another stemming from the former relationship. The nature of the koinonia in both areas determines the disciple's or Christian's attitude toward those without. But this can be a many-sided relationship, and the peculiar situation involved prescribes which side receives the emphasis. In the Synoptic Gospels the setting is more nearly that of Jesus' own lifetime and the background to Jesus' teaching is the ethic of the Pharisees and the Judaism of Palestine. In the Johannine writings the threat appears to come from a diaspora Judaism characterized by gnostic-like tendencies whose influence had gained some entrance into the church.

#### The Common Life: The Exclusive Character

The exclusive or holy character of the koinonia quality of life is inherent in the Johannine use of the term. John brings this

---

<sup>1</sup>Dodd, The Johannine Epistles, p. xlvii.

out as he rigidly applies the contrast of light and darkness in an ethical and religious manner.<sup>1</sup> "God is light and in him is no darkness at all" (I Jn. 1:5); so to have koinonia with him is incompatible with walking in darkness (I Jn. 1:6). Even to have koinonia with one another it is necessary to "walk in the light as he is in the light" where "the blood of Jesus his Son cleanses us from all sin" (1:7). A radical dichotomy exists between those whose koinonia "is with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ" (1:3) and the world: "If any one loves the world, love for the Father is not in him. For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh and the lust of the eyes and the pride of life, is not of the Father but is of the world" (2:15-16). Further "the whole world is in the power of the evil one ( $\epsilon\upsilon\tau\omega\ \pi\omicron\nu\eta\rho\omega\ \kappa\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha\iota$ )" (5:19).<sup>2</sup> Thus the world does not know the Christian because it did not know the Christ. (3:1)

The same dichotomy prevails in the Gospel. The world hates the disciples as it did Jesus (15:18; cf. 7:7) for they are not of the world as he is not of the world (15:19; 17:14, 16). Jesus is the light which shines as the revelation of the Father into the world (1:4-5; 9; 8:12). Men are in the darkness or in the light as they reject or respond to Jesus as the Christ (3:19-31). Those who are of the world do not know him (1:10). So in the Gospel it is Jesus him-

<sup>1</sup>For the background of the Johannine dualism cf. Howard, Christianity According to St. John, pp. 81-85; for the comparison of the dualism of the Epistle with that of the Qumran Literature, cf. Nauck, pp. 100-122.

<sup>2</sup>For the Johannine use of  $\kappa\omicron\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma$  cf. Schnackenburg, pp. 133-137; Lee, pp. 109-116; and Herman Sasse, " $\kappa\omicron\sigma\mu\epsilon\omega$ ,  $\kappa\omicron\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma$ ,  $\kappa\omicron\sigma\mu\iota\omicron\varsigma$ ,  $\kappa\omicron\sigma\mu\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ ," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. Gerhard Kittel (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1938), III, 894ff.

self who is the content and character of the exclusiveness of the koinonia. He is the light and those who refuse the revelation of God in him remain religiously and ethically in the world's darkness.

John uses the term world in this sense to refer to men and society as organized apart from God.<sup>1</sup> In the Gospel the Jews are representative of the darkness of the world in its hostility to God.<sup>2</sup> They are set in this position not only because they did so oppose Jesus during his lifetime, but also no doubt because of the opposition of the Hellenistic Judaism of the Dispersion against the Christians of John's day.<sup>3</sup> The point is, however, that the sharpness of the division between the church and the world at the time of the writing of the Johannine literature goes back to the division that was already present in Jesus' own lifetime, that separation brought about by the Jew's rejection of Jesus.<sup>4</sup> The relation of the koinonia to the world is that of Jesus himself.

The exclusive character of the koinonia is integrally involved in the very purpose of I John. The letter is written to Christians to furnish them with criteria by which they can be assured of eternal life (5:13).<sup>5</sup> While its basic aim is pastoral it contains a distinct polemical motive.<sup>6</sup> The very existence of the koinonia was endangered

---

<sup>1</sup>Lee, p. 110.

<sup>2</sup>Dahl, p. 129. The Gospel is not thereby anti-Jewish. Cf. J. A. T. Robinson, "The Destination and Purpose of St. John's Gospel," pp. 108ff.

<sup>3</sup>Lee, p. 122.

<sup>4</sup>E. Schweizer, Church Order in the New Testament, p. 121.

<sup>5</sup>Law, pp. 4-5.

<sup>6</sup>Brooke, xxvii-xxviii: "He is a pastor first, an orthodox



by a type of teaching which seemed to deny the need of a mediator such as Jesus was put forth to be in the tradition of the church. As Robinson comments, "they claimed direct knowledge of God, to have the Father without the Son."<sup>1</sup> While the details of the discussion in respect to the exact identification of the error cannot be entered in-  
to here,<sup>2</sup> the evidence as marshalled by Robinson<sup>3</sup> clearly points in the direction of an incipient Gnosticism resident in at least an element of the Hellenistic Jewish community amidst which the Johannine church was located.<sup>4</sup> The essence of the error lay in its distortion of the ethical and religious dualism of John in the direction of a metaphysical dualism which locates evil in matter rather than in moral choice. The end result is a denial of the reality of sin and the need for the incarnation.<sup>5</sup> Such false teaching threatened schism and apostasy in the church as it perverted both the Christological center of the koinonia and its ethical integrity. John comprehended both as he wrote, "if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship with one another, and the blood of Jesus his Son cleanses us from all sin" (1:7). In the face of an error so soteriologically false,

---

theologian only afterwards."

<sup>1</sup>Robinson, "The Destination and Purpose of the Johannine Epistles," P. 133.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Brooke, pp. xxxviii-lil; Schnackenburg, pp. 15-23.

<sup>3</sup>Robinson, "The Destination and Purpose of the Johannine Epistles," pp. 130-138.

<sup>4</sup>Dodd, pp. liii-liv, however, stresses the non-Jewish character of the modes of expression. Cf. Law, p. 26, who sees no connection between gnosticism and Judaism.

<sup>5</sup>Robinson, "The Destination and Purpose of the Johannine Epistles," pp. 133-134.

John proceeds to demonstrate that the koinonia quality of life is exclusive of both wrong belief and wrong conduct; its exclusiveness is both Christological and moral. The criteria for both is the actuality and continuing significance of the incarnation.

The Christological exclusiveness.---The character of the Christological exclusiveness of the Johannine koinonia in the Gospel is that of the revelatory character of the incarnate Jesus. It has already been seen that the presentation of Jesus as the Christ starts from the historical humanity of Jesus and seeks to unveil his role as the revealer of the life of God. The radical dividing line is the recognition of and personal trust in Jesus as the incarnate Son of God or his rejection by unbelief and personal antagonism.

This is evident as Jesus' role as the bearer of the fullness of the divine life is first introduced in the Gospel prologue as that of the eternal Word.<sup>1</sup> The Word is as a light shining in the darkness and "the darkness has neither understood nor quenched the light" (1:5).<sup>2</sup> He came into the world that was made through him but did not know him (1:10) and his own people did not receive him (1:11).

The unique revelatory role of Jesus is set forth most centrally by John as that of his relation to the Father as the divine Son (1:14, 18). The purpose of the Gospel has been posited to be evangelistic, that his readers may believe in the messiahship of

---

<sup>1</sup>See above, pp. 359f.

<sup>2</sup>Barrett, The Gospel According to St. John, p. 132. He suggests that John is probably playing on the two meanings of *καταλαμβάνω*.

Jesus;<sup>1</sup> a messiahship which is to be conceived above all, according to John, in terms of his relation of Sonship to the Father (20:31; cf. 11:21).<sup>2</sup> The line of demarcation is the matter of belief or non-belief in this Sonship: "God sent the Son into the world . . . He who believes in him is not condemned; he who does not believe is condemned already, because he has not believed in the name of the only Son of God" (3:17-18, cf. vs. 36). This is vividly seen in 8:53-59 where Jesus is asked by the Jews, "Who do you claim to be?" Jesus' answer, involving his Sonship ("it is my Father who glorifies me"), climaxes with "Truly, truly, I say to you, before Abraham was, I am." At this John records, "So they took up stones to throw at him."

The Christological exclusiveness of the koinonia is clearly expressed in the figure of the vine:<sup>3</sup> "I am the true vine . . . If a man does not abide in me, he is cast forth as a branch and withers; and the branches are gathered, thrown into the fire and burned" (15:1, 6).<sup>4</sup> This same distinct line of demarcation is maintained in the experience of the church through the ministry of the Paraclete, the Holy Spirit.<sup>5</sup> For Jesus told his disciples that they were to receive "the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it neither sees him nor knows him; you know him for he dwells with you,

---

<sup>1</sup>See above, p. 352.

<sup>2</sup>Van Unnik, "The Purpose of St. John's Gospel," p. 404.

<sup>3</sup>See above, p. 384.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Schweizer, Church Order in the New Testament, p. 119.

<sup>5</sup>See above, pp. 368-371.



and will be in you" (14:17). Of the Paraclete's ministry Jesus speaks, "and when he comes, he will convince the world of sin," which he goes on to define: "of sin, because they do not believe in me" (16:8-9). Sin in essence is a refusal to respond in life to the revelation of God made through Christ, whether in person as incarnate, or through the presence of his alter ego, the Holy Spirit in the church. Those who do not believe in Jesus' words "that I am he" (8:21) will die in their sins. Such are of their father the devil, the father of lies (8:44). The exclusive character of the koinonia is literally that of the Son himself. He is its crux.

The Christological exclusiveness of the koinonia is dealt with more directly in the Epistle in view of the claim of the false teachers who have gone out from the church (I Jn. 2:19). Their teaching is so opposed to the truth that John calls them "anti-christs"<sup>1</sup> who "went out from us, but . . . were not of us" (2:19). Their denial was basically that "Jesus is the Christ" (2:22; cf. 5:1) or that "Jesus is the Son of God" (4:15; 5:5). It was the revelatory role of the incarnate Jesus as the Son which was at stake: "This is the antichrist, he who denies the Father and the Son. No one who denies the Son has the Father. He who confesses the Son has the Father also" (2:22-23). Thus in line with the gnostic location of evil in matter was the denial of the incarnation, "that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh" (4:2; cf. II Jn. 7).

Excluded on the one hand is any view or belief that improper-

---

<sup>1</sup>For the background and significance of the designation "anti-Christ" cf. Dodd, The Johannine Epistles, pp. 48f.; Schnackenburg, pp. 145-149.

ly connects the historic Jesus with the Father. This John emphasizes by speaking of Jesus as "from the beginning" (1:1) as "the word of life" (1:1), as the one in whom the eternal life from the Father was manifested (1:2); and by his constant use of the term "Son" which implies the uniqueness ( $\mu\omicron\rho\omicron\upsilon\epsilon\rho\eta\tilde{\nu}$  4:9) of his relation to the Father. His final affirmation of faith is most emphatic: "we are in him who is true, in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life" (5:20).

On the other hand, any conception of Jesus is excluded which does not insist on the necessity and reality of his atoning death for sin: "This is he who came by water and blood, Jesus Christ, not with the water only, but with the water and the blood" (5:6). The salvation significance of Jesus lay not only in his baptism as if he were merely the first of a line of "spiritual" men in a gnostic sense,<sup>1</sup> but his death as well was in direct continuity with his unique relation to the Father and thus of redemptive significance.<sup>2</sup> Thus the stress falls occasionally in I John on "the blood of Jesus his Son" (1:7) and Jesus Christ as the "expiation for our sins" (2:1; 4:10). The Son is sent "as the Saviour of the world" (4:14). Here the close tie to the moral or ethical aspect of the koinonia is evident for such a view of Jesus necessitates the recognition of the moral ser-

---

<sup>1</sup>Schnackenburg, p. 258.

<sup>2</sup>John's statement seems to be in opposition to a view like that of Cerinthus who held that the divine Christ descended upon the human Jesus at his baptism but left him before his crucifixion. John is here insisting that Jesus is the Christ in virtue both of his baptism (the water) and his atoning death (the blood). Robinson, "The Destination and Purpose of the Johannine Epistles," p. 134. Cf. Brooke, p. 135.

iousness of sin: "the Son of God appeared . . . to destroy the works of the devil" (I Jn. 3:8). Any religious perspective which does not make the redemptive role of the incarnate Jesus as the Son of God crucial for fellowship with the Father is absolutely contrary to the very essence of the Johannine koinonia and must be labeled as antichrist. Such represents the kingdom of the devil, the realm of darkness: "They were not of us," wrote John, "for if they had been of us, they would have continued with us; but they went out, that it might be plain that they all are not of us" (2:19). The line between the realm of light and darkness remains clear cut, even though for a time the darkness may have infiltrated the church.<sup>1</sup> But such persons, once their true character is known, are to be strenuously avoided: "If any one comes to you and does not bring this doctrine, do not receive him into the house or give him any greeting; for he who greets him shares (κοινωνεῖ) his wicked work" (II Jn. 10-11).

The presence of the Holy Spirit in the lives of Christians is closely related to the correct confession of Jesus as the Christ. Their ability to know the truth is due to their being "anointed by the Holy One" (2:19) which is the Holy Spirit in close relation to the eye-witness tradition.<sup>2</sup> It is the Holy Spirit fulfilling his

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Schweizer, Church Order in the New Testament, p. 126.

<sup>2</sup>This is evident from a comparison of vss. 24 and 26. Dodd, The Johannine Epistles, p. 64 (cf. pp. 58-63), presses the parallel to the point where he concludes that the "anointing" is not the Holy Spirit, but the Word of God. They cannot, however, be separated in this passage as the earlier discussion of the Holy Spirit in John would indicate. See above, p. 371. That the reference is to the Holy Spirit is held by both Westcott, The Epistles of St. John,



function as the Spirit of truth.<sup>1</sup> In the believer he is the chrisma which alone makes for proper confession of the christos. And conversely the proof of the genuineness of the Spirit of God as opposed to the spirit of antichrist is whether or not it results in the confession that "Jesus Christ has come in the flesh" (4:2). This is the manner in which the spirits are discerned.<sup>2</sup> The two facets are intermingled in every reference or allusion to the Spirit, the agreement of the Spirit's testimony and that of the tradition:

This is he who came by water and blood, Jesus Christ, not with the water only but with the water and the blood. And the Spirit is the witness, because the Spirit is the truth. There are three witnesses, the Spirit, the water, and the blood; and these three agree. If we receive the testimony of men, the testimony of God is greater; for this is the testimony of God that he has borne witness to his Son. He who believes in the Son of God has the testimony in himself. He who does not believe God has made him a liar, because he has not believed in the testimony that God has borne to his Son. And this is the testimony, that God gave us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He who has the Son has life; he who has not the Son of God has not life (5:6-12; cf. 2:18-27; 3:23-4:3; 4:13-15.)

It is the function of the Spirit to carry out the Christological exclusiveness of the koinonia in the experience of the church.

It is very probable that "the mortal sin (*ἁμαρτία πρὸς θάνατον*)" of I John 5:16 belongs in this context of meaning. It has been seen that the essence of sin in the Gospel is refusal to believe in Jesus as the Christ, the Son of God. In this Epistle the sin of the antichrist is the same in essence (2:22; 4:2).

---

p. 73, and Schackenburg, pp. 152-153.

<sup>1</sup>See above, p. 371.

<sup>2</sup>Here there is very close affinity with the two spirits of truth and error found in IQS 3:13-4:26.

So the sin which is *πρὸς θάρσιν* is no doubt one not merely of moral failure, but of deliberate apostasy from Christ.<sup>1</sup> Such a one comes to reject with the Jews of the Gospel and the antichrists of the Epistle the validity of the revelatory role of the incarnate Jesus as the Son of God and its claims upon his own life.

The moral exclusiveness.—It is evident from the preceding discussion that the moral as well as the Christological exclusiveness of the *koinonia* is that of Jesus Christ. In the Gospel the basic sin of unbelief is closely related to a quality of life which is contrary to the light of God in his Son. Men avoid the light because their deeds are evil. They do not come to Jesus because he who has come to take away the sin of the world (Jn. 1:29) would expose the quality of their moral character. Rather they love the darkness of their sins and hate the light because there is no compromise between their sins and belief in Jesus (2:19-20; cf. 8:25). They belong to the realm of their Father the devil, in whom there is no truth (8:44). So excluded are all those deeds that belong to the realm of darkness and which stem from a rejection of Jesus as the light of God.

The moral exclusiveness of the *koinonia* has also already come into view in relation to the corporate ethic.<sup>2</sup> For all that is contradictory to the exercise of *agapē* in the common life is certainly foreign to the *koinonia*. In the figure of the vine and the branches the disciples abide in Christ by keeping his commandments

---

<sup>1</sup>Dodd, *The Johannine Epistles*, p. 136. Cf. Brooke, pp. 146f.

<sup>2</sup>See above pp. 389ff.

(15:9). Ethically, the koinonia excludes all conduct which is not consistent with the keeping of his commandments. And in the context the supreme commandment which comprehends the morality of the koinonia is the command to "love one another as I have loved you. Greater love has no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends. You are my friends if you do what I command you" (15:12-14).

The moral exclusiveness of the koinonia which is inherent in the Gospel is clearly brought to the fore in the Epistle. The koinonia is exclusive first and foremost of sin as darkness. God is light and to walk in darkness is absolutely incompatible with the koinonia (I Jn. 1:5-6) for its very essence is walking in the light (1:7; cf. 2:7-11). To walk in the light necessitates taking sin seriously and to live in separation from it through the atoning work of Jesus Christ (1:7, 9; 2:1-2). Sin is stressed in respect to its effect upon one's relation to God<sup>1</sup> as the writer has in mind<sup>2</sup> these those false teachers who deny the bearing of moral conduct on spiritual communion.<sup>3</sup> The guilt and moral pollution (1:9) resulting

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Law, p. 129, n. 1, for a logical analysis of the use of ἁμαρτία and cognates in I John. He rightly points out that the judicial view of sin characterizes I Jn. 1:7-2:2, that is, he is concerned with sin as an objective disability for fellowship with God which can only be removed by confession and propitiatory cleansing. The insertion, however, of ἀλλήλων in verse seven and the use of the more precisely ethical term ἀδικία in verse nine indicate its integral tie to actual ethical behavior which John goes on to develop in 2:3-11 and emphasize in 2:28-3:18.

<sup>2</sup>Schnackenburg, p. 73, points out that the repetition in the passage of εἰς τὸ πᾶν indicates that the writer keeps in mind the gnostic moral error throughout.

<sup>3</sup>Brooke, p. 10.



from unchristlike conduct (cf. 2:6) in interpersonal relationships (1:7; cf. 2:9-11) must be cleansed through the blood of Jesus (I Jn. 1:7). So the koinonia is exclusive of sin both in the relational (or judicial) and ethical sense for they cannot be separated. The latter results in the former and both must be radically dealt with in Jesus Christ.

The strong ethical content of the sin that must be forgiven and cleansed is developed in I John 2:3-11. To know God is to keep his commandments. By thus keeping God's word the love of God is brought to completion.<sup>1</sup> The ethical character of the koinonia can even be said to be that of Christ himself from whom stems a new commandment. And by the criteria of its standard "he who says he is in the light and hates his brother is in the darkness still. He who loves his brother abides in the light" (2:9-10). For John's purposes in the Epistle the sin that is most fundamentally inconsistent with the koinonia is that of the lack or denial of love for the Christian brother. While the reference to sin is perhaps more general and inclusive in I John 1:6-2:2 yet it is most characteristically in its manifestation as the failure of agapē that sin is darkness in contrast to light and thus destructive of the koinonia both toward God and toward man.

To walk in darkness is not to do the truth (1:6) because one's moral conduct reveals whether or not the truth is in him (1:8). In the Johannine koinonia the εἶναι and the ποιεῖν are inseparably one. What one does indicates the realm to which one belongs,

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Nauck, p. 103.

that of light or that of darkness, that of God or that of the devil.<sup>1</sup> This John goes on to demonstrate in his second major ethical discussion, I John 2:28-3:34,<sup>2</sup> as he stresses that the koinonia is exclusive of sin as belonging to the realm of the devil. The leading thought has changed from that of walking in the light to divine begetting. The emphasis moves from the concreteness of sin in man's experience to sin in its absolute ethical antagonism to the nature of God's children.<sup>3</sup>

The beginning criterion is that of Christ<sup>4</sup> as righteous<sup>5</sup> and he then who does righteousness is born of God (2:29, 3:7). Sin is defined as lawlessness (3:4), the denial of the absoluteness of moral obligation as conveyed in God's commandments (cf. I Jn. 3:22).<sup>6</sup> The very purpose of the coming of Christ who is sinless in his moral character is to do away with sins (3:5). Sin has its origin in the devil for he has been in lawless rebellion to God from the beginning (3:7). It is his works in the lives of men that the Son of God has appeared to destroy (3:8). He who is born of God partakes of the nature of the one who is in fundamental antagonism to sin, thus he cannot sin and be true to what he is.<sup>7</sup> It is the moral quality of

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Nauck, p. 103.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Schnackenburg's analysis of I John, p. 10.

<sup>3</sup>Law, p. 132.

<sup>4</sup>For this identification of the subject of verse 3:29, cf. Brooke, p. 68.

<sup>5</sup>This section is in continuity with the ἁδικία of I John 1:9.

<sup>6</sup>Law, p. 133.

<sup>7</sup>That is as far as he is a τέκνον Θεοῦ he cannot do the

human conduct in relation to the righteous will of God as revealed in this incarnate Son of God which indicates whether he is in possession of the koinonia quality of life (1:3) or has excluded himself from it; "By this it may be seen who are the children of God, and who are the children of the devil: whoever does not do right is not of God, nor he who does not love his brother" (3:10).

So again John comes back to the contrast between love and hatred. The law that sin as lawlessness is in violation to is the supreme law of love. Using the example of Cain he shows that hatred defined as the absence of agape<sup>1</sup> is irreconcilable with eternal life (3:11-15). The incarnate Jesus has been set forth as the ethical criterion of the koinonia (2:6; 2:29; 3:5),<sup>2</sup> but now for the first time in the Epistle Christ is presented as the ultimate manifestation of that love which is to pervade the church to the exclusion of sin:

By this we know love, that he laid down his life for us; and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren. But if any one has the world's goods and sees his brother in need, yet closes his heart against him, how does God's love abide in him? (3:16-17).

Sin expressed as the absence of love or hatred is brought down to the practical level of lack of concern for the genuine needs of others. Such is absolutely inconsistent with the love of God in Christ experienced by the church. Agapē-love, then, as John goes on to develop and apply it in terms of its definition in God's gift of his Son for men's

---

works of the devil. When he does commit a concrete sin it is a failure from weakness to realize in life his true character. Cf. Brooke, pp. 89-90.

<sup>1</sup>"He who does not love . . ." (I Jn. 3:14). Cf. Dewar, p. 205.

<sup>2</sup>It is certainly implied too in I Jn. 1:7: "as he is in the light."



sins (I Jn. 4:7-5:3) becomes the supreme ethical criterion of the koinonia excluding all that is contrary to it. The holy character of the koinonia again simply and most plainly in John is that of God himself as revealed in the incarnation.

### Conclusion

The actual Johannine use of the koinonia language centers in I John 1:3-7 where it expresses the practical essence of Johannine thought. By it John sums up in a word that "quality of life" whose implications he spins out in the remainder of the Epistle in terms of the need of his readers. In its use is packed the whole Johannine perspective of revelation and redemption.

As the object or end of the Christian proclamation the koinonia is a common life in the Son. Jesus Christ through his incarnate life and sacrificial death for the sins of the world, as the glorified Son of God, is the revealer of the fullness of the life of the Father. The Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Truth, brings to realization in the experience of the Church the revelation of God in his Son. The life that is thus realized, thus commonly shared in, is most definitively styled "eternal life," "the eternal life which was with the Father" (I Jn. 1:2). It is the authentic presence of the life of the age to come, a life which also looks to a future consummation. But most centrally for John the koinonia is "life . . . in his (God's) Son" (I Jn. 5:11).

As a common life the koinonia can best be expressed as one relationship in which religion and ethics are indistinguishably fused in concrete personal terms of agapē-love. The life in the Son which

constitutes the man-God relationship also constitutes the relationship which exists between men as common partakers of that life. Their unity which comes from a mutual abiding in the Son and the Father is likewise the unity of the Father and the Son in their mutual abiding, a relationship of agapē. And this agapē can only be defined with reference to that love manifested in the incarnation and the cross. Within the common life the relation of men to one another is the love which they have experienced in Jesus Christ, the Son of God. The ethic of the koinonia is Jesus himself, for the koinonia is a sharing in that life which is supremely agapē.

The exclusiveness of the Johannine koinonia in line with the preceding summary of its fundamental character can be viewed as Christological and moral. It is Christological in that it excludes those who deny the unique revelatory role of the human Jesus as the Son of God incarnate and refuse to put their trust in him as such. The reality of the incarnation including the cross, as well as the relation of the historic Jesus to the Father as Messianic Son, is crucial for Johannine koinonia. The ministry of the Holy Spirit in the Church is directly related to the correct apprehension of the revelatory role of Jesus as the Son of God. The exclusiveness is moral in that all that is contrary to the exercise of agapē is utterly alien to the common life. Ethically sin is defined from the perspective of the moral of holy character of the incarnate Jesus, viewed ultimately in terms of agapē. Sin as the failure of agapē seriously affects one's relation to the Father and must be forgiven and cleansed.

John's use of the koinonia language is in continuity with that

n/ in Acts and Paul.<sup>1</sup> It centers in God's action in Jesus Christ and reaches to every area of the lives of those who are taken up in that action. With John, as with Paul, all avenues lead to the person of Jesus Christ in the presentation of "the koinonia quality of life." John even more directly than Paul finds the content of every category which is used to characterize the koinonia in God's revelatory action in the incarnate Son. Joh's utilization of koinonia in the one passage in the Epistle reaches the acme of simplicity, depth and comprehensiveness as he sums up in practical application the totality of the Christian message as a common life, life in the Son. This life is one in the Christian's relation to God and in his relation to men. In it, most explicitly in John, religion and ethics are indistinguishably fused.

---

<sup>1</sup>See above, pp. 251-253.



## CONCLUSION

The role of the koinonia language in the New Testament can be described as one of unique usefulness as it bears witness to what has been termed "the koinonia quality of life." This is due more to the unique dual-dimensional capacity of the koinonia language itself than to any predetermined design on the part of the New Testament writers. For it was the contexts in which they used the language that gave it any particular religious significance rather than any such sense being ascribed to the words themselves. They did, however, find them most useful at vital points in their presentation of the implications of the gospel of Jesus Christ.

The fundamental signification of koinonia and cognates as demonstrated from the study of its non-New Testament usage is confirmed to be that of "having something in common with someone else." The idea of association in sharing is subordinate to that of the sharing in, although in particular instances the former can predominate. Usually both facets of meaning are involved in the use of the words and very rarely does one emphasis entirely exclude the other. Indeed the peculiar usefulness of the language depends on the presence of both dimensions.

In the New Testament it is this dual-dimensional capability of the koinonia language as variously applied by the New Testament authors to the salvation reality of God in Christ through the Holy Spirit which is suggestive of a "koinonia concept." Involved at the

center of such usage in keeping with the basic force of the terminology is a "sharing-together quality of life" occasioned by a common relation to Christ, expressed in a corporate ethic and qualified by a sense of the holy. In Luke's summary characterization of the first Church in Acts 2:42 his use of  $\tau\eta\ \kappa\omicron\iota\nu\nu\omega\nu\acute{\iota}\alpha$  evidences the primitive core of this synthesizing idea to which the koinonia language uniquely bears witness. The horizontal "sharing-together" in vertical Divine reality here intimated in essence comes to explicit expression in I John 1:3: "that you may have fellowship ( $\kappa\omicron\iota\nu\nu\omega\nu\acute{\iota}\alpha$ ) with us; and our fellowship ( $\kappa\omicron\iota\nu\nu\omega\nu\acute{\iota}\alpha$ ) is with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ." The "koinonia concept" then has to do with the practical realization in life of God's saving activity in Christ viewed as a "sharing-together quality of life." It must be stressed that the concept does not spring from any technical sense which the words have acquired, but from their total use in the New Testament. The uniqueness of the relation between the language and the concept which is attested by its use is not that the idea does not find expression in various other ways in the New Testament, but that no one term is so suited to penetrate the heart of it as is koinonia.

This koinonia "quality of life," which is seen in relation to the koinonia language most distinctively in the Acts of the Apostles, the letters of Paul and the Johannine literature, stands in direct heilsgeschichtliche continuity with the Covenant relationship of God with Israel in the Old Testament. It was in this relationship that the sense of solidarity which characterized ancient Semitic societies became most intense. Israel's sharing together in the Covenant resulted in a "quality of life" conditioned by a loyalty to God which affected

every aspect of life, and which when failed of in the life of the people gave rise in the hearts of the faithful to the hope of an ideal fulfilment in a new covenant. Thus the New Testament koinonia is integrally rooted in the Covenant-hope of the Old Testament faith.

The Old Testament covenant unity with its attendant hope was preserved with varying legalistic and eschatological emphases in the Judaism of New Testament times. Historical conditions had brought about a Law-religion as the proper content of the Covenant-life and as the necessary pre-requisite of any fulfilment of the Covenant-hope. This rigid adherence to the Law was conditioned in many quarters of Judaism by an acute eschatological hope and was characterized by an heightened awareness of the ritual holy which both intensified and destroyed a sense of koinonia. Thus groups such as the Pharisees and the Essenes who attempt to be true to the Covenant in their own peculiar manner, though they increased the sense of covenant unity among themselves, actually tended to break it down in Israel as a whole. True covenant unity became more and more a matter of eschatological and even apocalyptic hope often conceived in a narrow sectarian manner.

It is the valid elements in this covenant hope of the Kingdom that find fulfilment in the life and ministry of Jesus, which in turn furnishes the immediate impetus for the New Testament koinonia. For it is in the eschatological significance of Jesus' person and mission, in his radical summons to men and in the saving action of God released in the culminating events of his death and resurrection that God's redemption activity on behalf of men reaches a new climax. The continuing result is a renewed and refined covenant unity with God through the Spirit of God in the lives of those who respond in direct and



characteristic continuity with the former "life-together" of the disciples with Jesus. Jesus himself becomes the definitive content of this New Covenant "quality of life." This is the reality which the New Testament writers seek to interpret and apply with the koinonia language.

A, In acts 2:42 Luke employs the expression "the koinonia" to describe the unique community quality of the first Christian society as it found expression in ways that almost ideally exhibited its inner character. The reference is to a "sharing"--a quality of life constituted by the eschatological action of God, defined explicitly in Jesus Christ and now dynamically implemented by the Holy Spirit. But this quality of life in virtue of the new relation to God involves a new relationship among men within the covenant community. It is upon this aspect of "the sharing" that the stress falls--a quality of life, as evidenced by the "all things in common" (Acts 2:44), in fulfilment of that covenant love which Jesus demonstrated in the midst of the first disciples. Implicit too in "the koinonia" is what can be called the holy character of the early church. For as indicated in the deception of Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 5:1-11) in contrast to the generous action of Barnabas (Acts 4:32-37), inherent in the society of believers as constituted by the Holy Spirit was the demand of radical personal obedience to that Spirit as the instrument of the eschatological action of God in Jesus Christ. "The koinonia" in Acts is a quality of life at the heart of the first Christian community which can be seen both in fulfilment of the Kingdom purpose of Jesus' messianic ministry and as involved in the continuation of the mission of the Servant in his task of bearing witness to God's action in Christ among men.

a/ It is Paul who finds the koinonia language most useful in his efforts to relate the redemptive reality of Jesus Christ to the ethical and evangelistic concerns of the Christian community. For him "the koinonia" is a common life, a joint participation in the life of Christ viewed eschatologically as the saving action of God. It is a "sharing-together quality of life" effected by the Holy Spirit as the life of Christ in redemptive action, and which extends to a participation in the total ministry of Christ reaching even to his messianic sufferings in the propagation of the gospel. More explicitly evident even than in Acts is the fact that "the koinonia" is supremely characterized by Jesus Christ in the full significance of his person. The quality of all Christian inter-personal relationships ~~are~~ to be conditioned by the realization that in virtue of their "sharing-together" in Christ they are the body of Christ. Any failure of agapē-love is a sin against that body and thus against Christ in whom salvation of God is manifest. Paul's use of the language is to indicate the way in which this "sharing-together in Christ quality of life" is to penetrate and transform every relationship of the Christian. This involves the holiness of the koinonia which is again that of an uncompromising loyalty to the person of Christ. For "the koinonia" is shown to be exclusive of all unethical and immoral conduct and especially all compromising association with idolatry. So while "the koinonia" in Paul remains in direct continuity with Acts, its various aspects find fuller development and more complete expression as Paul, more than any other New Testament writer, employs the dual-dimensional koinonia words to relate the salvation action of God in Christ to almost every phase of Christian responsibility. Even as he writes of the ongoing ministry of Christ through the instrumental-

15/

ity of the Church the stress is upon the bond between those thus engaged, upon the realistic link between the sufferings thus endured and those of Christ, and upon the mutual concern revealed in the giving of actual material aid.

The capstone is placed upon the New Testament koinonia in the Johannine writings. In continuity with Acts and Paul John's use of koinonia in his first Epistle centers in God's action in Jesus Christ and reaches to every area of the lives of those who are taken up in that action. "The koinonia" is a common life in the Son, a "sharing-together" through the witness and presence of the Spirit of Truth in the life of the age to come--eternal life. It is one relationship in which religion and ethics are indistinguishably fused in concrete personal terms of agapē-love, the love manifest in the incarnation and the cross of Jesus the Christ. The life in the Son which constitutes the man-God relationship also constitutes the relationship which exists between men as common partakers of that life which is supremely agapē. It is the love which they have experienced in Jesus Christ the Son of God that characterizes the relation of men to one another in the common life. "The koinonia" is exclusive of all that is contrary to the exercise of agapē as expressive of the moral or holy character of the incarnate Jesus. Such sin needs forgiveness and cleansing for a right relation to the Father. Further, "the koinonia" excludes all refusal of the unique revelatory role of the historic Jesus as the Son of God. Thus John by koinonia, in an unique combination of simplicity, depth and comprehensiveness, sums up in practical application the totality of the Christian message as a common life, life in the Son.

Throughout the developing koinonia concept in the New Testament,



its constitution by God's saving action in Christ, its expression in a genuine corporate concern, and its demarcation by the holy character of that eschatological action by which it exists, are all present, although variously unfolded by the different writers. It is evident in primitive force in Acts, in comprehensive application in Paul and in breath-taking simplicity in John. The abiding value of the New Testament koinonia is its union of religion and ethics in a "sharing-together quality of life" that is completely characterized by Jesus Christ in the full eschatological bearing of his person. The great contribution of the concept to Christian thought and life is its ability to express and to emphasize the essential oneness of man's relationship to God with his responsibility to his fellow man. The primary thrust of the New Testament koinonia is ethical and practical. Thus when Paul Lehmann describes Christian ethics as "a koinonia ethic" and defines "the koinonia" as "the fellowship-creating reality of Christ's presence in the world"<sup>1</sup> he has legitimate New Testament grounds.

---

<sup>1</sup>Paul L. Lehmann, Ethics in a Christian Context, pp. 14, 49.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agyptische Urkunden aus den Königlichen Museen zu Berlin: Griechische Urkunden. 8 vols. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1895-1933.
- Ahern, Barnabas M. "The Fellowship of His Sufferings (Phil. 3, 10) —A Study of St. Paul's Doctrine on Christian Suffering," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXII (January, 1960), 1-32.
- Albright, W. F. "Recent Discoveries in Palestine and the Gospel of St. John," The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology. Edited by W. D. Davies and D. Daube. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1956, pp. 153-171.
- The Amherst Papyri. Vols. I-II. Edited by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt. Oxford: University Press Warehouse, 1901.
- Anderson, G. W. A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament, Studies in Theology No. 52. Edited by Nathaniel Micklem. London: Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., 1959.
- Angus, S. The Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World. London: John Murray, 1929.
- Anrich, Gustav. Das antike Mysterienwesen in seinem Einfluss auf das Christentum. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1894.
- Aristides. Vol. I. Edited by G. Dindorf. Lipsiae: Libraria Weidmannia, G. Reimer, 1829.
- Arndt, William F. and Gingrich, F. Wilbur. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1957.
- Arnim, (Johannes von) Ioannes ab. Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta. Vol. III. Lipsiae: In Aedibus B. G. Teubneri, 1903.
- Artemidori Dalidiani, Onirocriticon Libri V. Edited by Rudolph Hercher. Lipsiae: In Aedibus, B. G. Teubneri, 1864.

- Asting, Ragnar. Die Heiligkeit im Urchristentum. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1930.
- 4/ Baillie, John. The Sense of the Presence of God. London: Oxford University Press, 1962.
- Baird, William. Paul's Message and Mission. New York: Abingdon Press, 1960.
- Barr, James. The Semantics of Biblical Language. London: Oxford University Press, 1961.
- Barrett, C. K. The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition. London: S.P.C.K., 1947.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel," Journal of Theological Studies, I, new series, 1950, 1-15.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Gospel According to St. John. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1955.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Epistle to the Romans. London: A. & G. Black, 1957.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Background of Mark 10:45," New Testament Essays. Edited by A. J. B. Higgins. Manchester: The University Press, 1959, 1-18.
- Barth, Karl. The Epistle to the Romans. Translated by Edwyn C. Hoskins from 6th German Edition. Oxford: University Press, 1933.
- Barth, Markus. Die Taufe - Ein Sakrament? Zurich: Evangelischer Verlag, A. G. Zollikon, 1951.
- Barthelemy, D. and Milik, J. T. Qumran Cave I: Discoveries in the Judean Desert. Vol. I. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1955.
- Bartling, W. "The New Creation in Christ: A Study of the Pauline Formula," Concordia Theological Monthly, XXI (1950), 401-418.
- Bauer, Walter. Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur. Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1952.
- Beardslee, William H. Human Achievement and Divine Vocation in the Message of Paul. Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 4. Naperville, Illinois: Alec R. Allenson, 1961.
- Beare, Francis Wright. The First Epistle of Peter. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1947.



- The Beginnings of Christianity. Part I, The Acts of the Apostles.  
 Edited by F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake. 5 vols.  
 London: Macmillan and Co., 1920-1933.
- Beim, Johannes. "αἶμα", Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Vol. I. Edited by G. Kittel. Stuttgart: Verlag von W. Kohlhammer, 1933, pp. 171-175.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "διαθήκη", Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Vol. II. Edited by G. Kittel. Stuttgart: Verlag von W. Kohlhammer, 1935, pp. 127-137.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "κλάω, κλάσις, κλάσμα", Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Vol. III. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1938, pp. 726-743.
- Best, Ernest. One Body in Christ. London: S.P.C.K., 1955.
- Bigg, Charles. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude. The International Critical Commentary. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902.
- Black, Matthew. An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts. 2nd ed. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1946.
- Blass, Friedrich. Grammetik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch. Bearbeitet von Albert Debrunner, Achte Auflage. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1949.
- Boman, Thorlief. Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek. Translated by Jules L. Moreau. London: SCM Press, 1960.
- Bonhöffer, Adolf. Epiktet und das Neue Testament. Giessen: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1911.
- Bonnard Pierre. L'Épître de Saint Paul aux Philippiens. Commentaire du Nouveau Testament. Vol. X. Neuchâtel and Paris: Delachaux and Niestlé S.A., 1950.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Mourir et vivre avec Jésus-Christ selon saint Paul," Revue d'histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses. XXXVI (1956), 101-112.
- Bonsirven, Joseph. Épîtres de Saint Jean. Verbum Salutis. Vol. IX. Paris: Beauchesne et ses Fils, 1947-1954.
- Bornkamm, Günther. "Herrenmahl und Kirche bei Paulus," Gesammelte Aufsätze, Band II. Studien Zu Antike und Urchristentum. Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie, Band 28. München: Ch. Kaiser Verlag, 1959, pp. 138-176.

- . Jesus of Nazareth. Translated by Irene and Fraser McLuskey with James M. Robinson. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1960.
- Bright, John. The Kingdom of God. New York: Abingdon Cokesbury, 1953.
- Brooke, A. E. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Johannine Epistles. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928.
- Brown, Francis, Driver, S. R., and Briggs, Charles. A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1901-1955.
- Brown, R. E. "The Qumran Scrolls and the Johannine Gospel and Epistles," The Scrolls and the New Testament. Edited by Kristar Stendahl. London: SCM Press, 1958, 183-207.
- Brownlee, W. H. The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline, Translation and Notes. Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research Supp. Studies. Nos. 10-12. New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1951.
- Bruce, F. F. The Acts of the Apostles. Chicago: The Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship, 1952.
- . Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts. London: Tyndale Press, 1959.
- Roman, Thorlief. Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek. Translated by Jules L. Moreau. London: SCM Press, 1960.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. "Analyse des ersten Johannesbriefe," Festgabe für Adolph Jülicher. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1927, 138-158.
- . Das Evangelium des Johannes, Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. 11th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1950.
- . "Die kirchliche Redaktion des ersten Johannesbriefs," In Memoriam Ernst Lohmeyer. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1951, 181-201.
- . The Theology of the New Testament. Vol. II. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. London: SCM Press, 1955.
- . Primitive Christianity in its Contemporary Setting. Translated by R. H. Fuller. Edinburgh: Collins, The Fontana Library, 1960.

- Burrows, Millar. The Dead Sea Scrolls. London: Secker and Warburg, 1956.
- \_\_\_\_\_. More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls. London: Secker and Warburg, 1958.
- Burrows, Millar, Trever, John C., and Brownlee, William H. The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery. Vol. I. New Haven: The American Schools of Oriental Research, 1950.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery. Vol. II. Fascicle 2: Plates and Transmissions of the Manual of Discipline. New Haven: The American School of Oriental Research, 1951.
- Burton, Ernest De Witt. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians. The International Critical Commentary. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1920.
- Buttmann, Philipp K. Lexilogus. Translated by J. R. Fishlake. London: John Murray, 1846.
- Buttrick, George A. (ed.) The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. 4 vols. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962.
- Cadbury, Henry J. "The Hellenists," Additional Notes to the Commentary. Edited by Kirsopp Lake and Henry J. Cadbury. Vol. V. The Beginnings of Christianity. Edited by F. J. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake. London: Macmillan and Co., 1833, pp. 59-74.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Making of Luke-Acts. 2nd ed. London: S.P.C.K., 1958.
- Caird, G. B. The Apostolic Age. London: Gerald Duckworth and Co., 1955.
- Campbell, J. Y. "Κοινωνία and Its Cognates in the New Testament," Journal of Biblical Literature. Vol. LI (1932), 352-380.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Kingdom of God Has Come," Expository Times. XLVIII (1936-1937), 91-94.
- Carmignac, J. La règle de la Guerre des Fils de Lumière contre les Fils de Ténèbres. Paris: Letouzey et Ané. 1958.
- Carr, Arthur. "The Fellowship (Κοινωνία) of Acts 2:42 and Cognate Words," The Expositor. 8th series. Vol. V (1913), 458-464.



- Charles, R. H. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament. 2 vols. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1913.
- \_\_\_\_\_. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John. The International Critical Commentary. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1920.
- Clark, K. "Realized Eschatology," Journal of Biblical Literature. LIX (1940), 367-374.
- Clark, Neville. An Approach to the Theology of the Sacraments. Studies in Biblical Theology. No. 17. London: SCM Press, 1956.
- Cobham, J. O. "Covenant," A Theological Word Book of the Bible. Edited by Alan Richardson. London: SCM Press, 1957, pp. 54-61.
- Congelmann, Hans. The Theology of Luke. Translated by Geoffrey Buswell. London: Faber and Faber, 1960.
- Copleston, Frederick. Greece and Rome. Vol. I: A History of Philosophy. Burns Oates and Washbourne Ltd., Publishers to the Holy See, 1946.
- Craig, Clarence Tucker. The First Epistle to the Corinthians. Vol. X: The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by Nolan B. Harmon. New York: Abingdon Press, 1953.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. "Fellowship, Communion," A Theological Word Book of the Bible. Edited by Alan Richardson. London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1950, pp. 81-83.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Gospel According to Saint Mark. Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary. Edited by C. F. D. Moule. Cambridge: At University Press, 1959.
- Cremer, Hermann. Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek. 4th English edition. Translated from 2nd German edition. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1880, 1886.
- Cross, Frank Moore Jr. The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies. London: Gerald Duckworth and Co., Ltd., 1958.
- Cullmann, Oscar; Leenhardt, F. J. Essays on the Lords Supper. Translated by J. G. Davies. London: Lutterworth Press, 1958.
- Cullmann, Oscar. The Earliest Christian Confessions. Translated by J. K. S. Reid. London: The Lutterworth Press, 1942.

- \_\_\_\_\_ . The Earliest Christian Confessions. London: Lutterworth Press, 1949.
- \_\_\_\_\_ . Christ and Time, The Primitive Conception of Time and History. Translated by F. V. Filson. London: SCM Press, 1951.
- \_\_\_\_\_ . Early Christian Worship. Studies in Biblical Theology. No. 10. Translated by A. Stewart Todd and James B. Torrance. London: SCM Press, 1953.
- \_\_\_\_\_ . Peter, Disciple-Apostle-Martyr. Translated by Floyd V. Filson. London: SCM Press, 1953.
- \_\_\_\_\_ . The Early Church. Edited by A. J. B. Higgins, translated by A. J. B. Higgins and S. Godman. London: SCM Press, 1956.
- \_\_\_\_\_ . "The Significance of the Qumran Text for Research into Beginnings of Christianity," The Scrolls and the New Testament. Edited by Krister Stendahl. London: SCM Press, 1958, pp. 18-32.
- \_\_\_\_\_ . The Christology of the New Testament. Translated by Shirley Guthrie and Charles A. M. Hall. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1959.
- Dahl, Nils Alstrup. "The Johannine Church and History," Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation. Edited by William Klassen and Graydon F. Snyder. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962, pp. 124-142.
- Dalman, Gustaf. The Words of Jesus. Translated by D. M. Kay. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909.
- \_\_\_\_\_ . Jesus-Jeshua, Studies in the Gospels. Translated by Paul F. Levertoff. London: S.P.C.K., 1929.
- Danby, Herbert. Translator. The Mishnah. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1933.
- Daube, David. The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism. London: University of London, The Athlone Press, 1956.
- Davies, W. D. Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology. London: S.P.C.K., 1948.
- \_\_\_\_\_ . "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Flesh and Spirit," The Scrolls and the New Testament. Edited by Krister Stendahl. London: SCM Press, 1958, pp. 171-182.

- \_\_\_\_\_. Christian Origins and Judaism. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1962.
- Debrunner, Albert, Kleinknecht, Herman, Procksch, Otto, and Kittel, Gerhard. "λέγω, λόγος, ῥήμα, λαλέω," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Vol. IV. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1942, pp. 69-139.
- Deissmann, Adolf. Die neutestamentliche Formel "in Christo Jesu." Marburg: Elwert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1894.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Bible Studies. Translated by Alexander Grieve. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1901.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Paul, A Study in Social and Religious History. Translated by William E. Wilson. New York: George H. Doran Co., 1926.
- Delling, Gerhard. Der Gottesdienst im Neuen Testament. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1952.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "πληρώω," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Vol. VI. Edited by Gerhard Friedrich. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1959, pp. 285-296.
- Denney, James. Jesus and the Gospel. New York: Hodder and Stoughton, 1908.
- \_\_\_\_\_. St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. The Expositor's Greek Testament. Vol. II. Edited by S. Robertson Nicoll. Grand Rapids: Sm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company. n.d.
- Dewar, Lindsay. An Outline of New Testament Ethics. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1949.
- Dibelius, Martin. An die Thessalonicher I-II, An die Philipper. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. 2nd revised edition. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1925.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Die Pastoralbriefe. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. Edited by Hans Lietzmann. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1931.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Studies in the Acts of the Apostles. Edited by Heinrich Greeven and translated by Mary Ling. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1956.
- von Dobschütz, E. "Johanneische Studien I," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft. Vol. VIII. (1907), 1-8.



Dodd, C. H. The Epistle of Paul to the Romans. The Moffatt New Testament Commentary. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1932.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Bible and the Greeks. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Parables of the Kingdom. 3rd edition. London: Nisbet and Co., Ltd., 1936.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The First Epistle of John and the Fourth Gospel," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library. Vol. XXI (1937), 129-156.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Johannine Epistles. The Moffatt New Testament Commentary. London: Hodder and Stoughton, Ltd., 1946.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1953.

Duff, J. Wright. "Communion with Deity (Greek and Roman)," Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics. Vol. III. Edited by James Hastings. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1910, pp. 763-771.

Duncan, G. S. The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians. The Moffatt New Testament Commentary. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1937.

Eichrodt, Walter. Theologie des Alten Testaments. 3 vols. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1933, 1935, 1939.

\_\_\_\_\_. Man in the Old Testament. Translated by K. and R. Gregor Smith. London: SCM Press, 1951.

Egstein, Isidore. Judaism, A Historical Presentation. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd., 1959.

Eusebius. The Ecclesiastical History. Translated by J. F. Culton from the edition published in accordance with A. J. Fowler. Loeb Classical Library. Edited by T. E. Page, E. Capps, W. H. D. Rouse. London: William Heinemann, 1932.

Falconer, Robert. The Pastoral Epistles. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1937.

Feuillet, A. "La participation actuelle à la vie divine d'après le quatrième évangile. Les origines et le sens de cette conception," Studia Evangelica. Edited by K. Aland, F. L. Cross, J. Danielou, H. Riesenfeld, and W. C. van Unnik. Vol. 73. Texts und Untersuchungen. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1959, pp. 295-308.

- Filson, Floyd B. The Gospel According to St. Matthew. Black's New Testament Commentaries. Edited by Henry Chadwick. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1960.
- Flew, R. N. Jesus and His Church. London: The Epworth Press, 1938.
- Flusser, David. "The Dead Sea Sect and Pre-Pauline Christianity," Scripta Hierosolymitana. Vol. IV, Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Edited by Chaim Rabin and Yigael Yadin. Jerusalem: At the Magnes Press, The Hebrew University, 1958, pp. 215-266.
- Friedrich, Gerhard. "εὐαγγέλιον," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Vol. II. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1935, pp. 718-734.
- Fuller, Reginald H. The New Testament in Current Study. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1942.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Mission and Achievement of Jesus. Studies in Biblical Theology. No. 12. London: SCM Press, 1954.
- Gardner, E. Clinton. Biblical Faith and Social Ethics. New York: Harper and Row, Publisher, 1960.
- Gaster, T. H. Passover, Its History and Traditions. New York: Henry Schuman, 1949.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Dead Sea Scriptures. New York: Doubleday and Company, 1956.
- Gaiglor, Ernst. Der Römerbrief Prophezei. Zurich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1945.
- Gealy, Fred D. The First and Second Epistles to Timothy and the Epistle to Titus. The Interpreter's Bible. Vol. XI. Edited by Nolan B. Harmon. New York: Abingdon Cokesbury, 1955.
- George, A. Raymond. Communion with God in the New Testament. London: The Epworth Press, 1951.
- Ginsberg, C. D. The Essenes, The Kabbalah. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, Ltd., 1955.
- Goguel, Maurice. The Life of Jesus. Translated by Olive Wyon. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1933.
- Goodenough, Erwin R. An Introduction to Philo Judaeus. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940.



- \_\_\_\_\_ . "John a Primitive Gospel," Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. LXIV (1945), 145-182.
- Grant, F. C. Ancient Judaism and the New Testament. New York: Macmillan and Co., 1959.
- Greek Papyri in the British Museum. 5 vols. Edited by F. G. Kenyon and H. I. Bell. London: Printed by an order of the trustees, 1893-1917.
- Gressmann, H. "Ἡ κοινωρία τῶν δαδμορίων," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft. Vol. XX. (1921), 224-230. ω/
- Grosheide, F. W. Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians. The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Edited by N. B. Stonehouse. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1953.
- Guthrie, Donald. New Testament Introduction, Hebrews to Revelation. London: The Tyndale Press, 1962.
- Haenchen, E. Ernst. Die Apostelgeschichte, Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. 12th revised edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959.
- \_\_\_\_\_ . "Johanneische Probleme," Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, Vol. LVI (1959), 19-55.
- \_\_\_\_\_ . "Neuere Literature zu den Johannesbriefen," Theologische Rundschau, Vol. XXVI (1960), 1-43, 267-291.
- Hamilton, Neill Q. The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in Paul. Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers. No. 6. Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd Ltd., 1957.
- Hauck, D. Frederick. "κοινός, κοινωρός, κοινωρέω, κοινωρία, συγκοινωρός, συγκοινωρέω, κοινωρικός, κοινόςω," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Vol. III. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Stuttgart: Verlag von W. Kohlhammer, 1938, pp. 789-810.
- Hauck, Friedrich. Die Briefe des Jakobus, Petrus, Judas und Johannes (Kirchenbriefe), Das Neue Testament Deutsch. 8th edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1957.
- Heiland, Wolfgang. "δυσθεμία δόξ," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Vol. V. Edited by Gerhard Friedrich. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1954, pp. 185-186.



- Helbing, Robert. Die Kasusyntax der Verba bei den Septuaginta, Ein Beitrag zur Hebraisierfrage und zur Syntax der Koeln. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1925.
- Hering, Jean. La Première Epître de Saint Paul aux Corinthiens. Vol. VII of Commentaire du Nouveau Testament. Neuchâtel and Paris: Delachaux and Niestlé, 1949.
- \_\_\_\_\_. La Seconde Epître de Saint Paul aux Corinthiens. Vol. VIII of Commentaire du Nouveau Testament. Neuchâtel: Delachaux and Niestlé, 1958.
- Hermetica I-III. Edited by Walter Scott. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1924-26.
- Corpus Hermeticum I-IV. Edited by A. D. Nock and A. J. Festugiere. Paris: Societe d'Édition, "Les Belles Lettres," 1949-1954.
- Hanson, R. P. C. The Second Epistle to the Corinthians. The Torch Bible Commentaries. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1961.
- Higgins, A. J. B. The Lord's Supper in the New Testament. Studies in Biblical Theology. No. 6. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1952.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Son of Man -- Forschung dñce 'The Teaching of Jesus'," New Testament Essays, Studies in Memory of Thomas Walter Manson. Edited by A. J. B. Higgins. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959, pp. 119-135.
- Hooker, Morna D. Jesus and The Servant. London: S.P.C.K., 1959.
- Hopwood, P. G. S. The Religious Experience of the Primitive Church. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1936.
- Hort, Fenton John Anthony. The Christian Ecclesia. London: Macmillan and Co., 1908.
- Horton, Walter Marshall. "The Christian Community: Its Lord and Its Fellowship, The Biblical Basic for Christian Ethics," Interpretation. Vol. IV. (1950), 387-400.
- Hoskyns, Edwyn Clement. The Fourth Gospel. Edited by Francis Noel Davey. London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1947.
- Howard, W. F. Christianity According to St. John. London: Duckworth, 1943.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Common Authorship of the Johannine Gospel and Epistles," Journal of Theological Studies. Vol. XLVIII (1947), 12-25.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Gospel According to St. John," Interpreter's Bible. Vol. VIII. Edited by Nolan B. Harmon. New York: Abingdon Press, 1952.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation. Revised by C. K. Barrett. 4th ed. London: The Epworth Press, 1955.
- Hunter, A. M. The Work and Words of Jesus. London: SCM Press, 1950.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Introducing the New Testament. 2nd ed. London: SCM Press, 1957.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Recent Trends in Johannine Studies," The Expository Times. Vol. LXXI (1959-1960), 164-167, 219-222.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Interpreting Paul's Gospel. London: SCM Press, 1960.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Interpreting the Parables. London: SCM Press, 1960.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Paul and His Predecessors. London: SCM Press, 1961.
- Iamblichus, Chalcidensis. De Vita Pythagorae. Edited by Iohanne Arcerio Theodoreto. In Bibliopolio Commeliniano, 1598.
- Jeremias, Joachim. The Parables of Jesus. Translated by S. H. Hooke. London: SCM Press, 1954.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Eucharistic Words of Jesus. Translated by Arnold Ehrhardt. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Jesus' Promise to the Nations. Studies in Biblical Theology. No. 24. Translated by S. H. Hooke. London: SCM Press, 1958.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Qumran Texts and the New Testament," The Expository Times. Vol. LXX (1958), 68-69.
- Johnson, Aubrey R. The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1949.
- Johnston, George. The Doctrine of the Church in the New Testament. Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan, 1943.
- Jourdan, George. "KOINΩNIA in I Corinthians 10:16," Journal of Biblical Literature. Vol. LXVII, Part II (June 1948), 111-124.

Käsemann, E. "Anliegen und Eigenart der paulinischen Abendmahlslehre," Evangelische Theologie. March-April, 1948, pp. 263-283.

Kennedy, H. A. A. The Epistle to the Philippians. Expositor's Greek Testament. Edited by W. Robertson Nicoll. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1903.

Kittel, Gerhard. "ἀκολουθεῖν, ἐξ-, ἐπ-, παρ-, συγκατακολουθεῖν," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Vol. I. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1932-1933, pp. 210-216.

Klausner, J. The Messianic Idea in Israel. Translated by W. F. Stinespruing. London: G. Allen and Unwin, 1956.

Kleinknecht, Hermann. "ἑταῖρος," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Vol. III. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1938, pp. 122-123.

Knox, John. Chapters in a Life of Paul. New York: Abingdon Cokesbury, 1950.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Epistle to the Romans. The Interpreter's Bible. Vol. IX. Edited by Nolan B. Harmon. New York: Abingdon Press, 1954.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Epistle to Philemon. Interpreter's Bible. Vol. XI. Edited by Nolan B. Harmon. New York, Abingdon Press, 1955.

\_\_\_\_\_. Philemon Among the Letters of Paul. Revised edition. New York: Abingdon Press, 1959.

Knox, Wilfred L. The Acts of the Apostles. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1948.

Köhler, Ludwig. Theologie des Alten Testaments. 2nd ed. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1947.

Kosmala, Hans. Hebräer - Essener - Christen - Studien zur Vorgeschichte der frühchristlichen Verkündigung. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959.

Kuhn, Karl Georg. "The Lord's Supper and the Communal Meal at Qumran." The Scrolls and the New Testament. Edited by Krister Stendahl. London: SCM Press, 1958, pp. 65-93.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Two Messiahs of Aaron and Israel," The Scrolls and the New Testament. Edited by Krister Stendahl. London: SCM Press, 1958, pp. 54-64.



- Kühner, Raphael. Ausführliche Grammatik der Griechischen Sprache. Teil I, Band II. Dritte Auflage von Friedrich Blass. Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1892.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Ausführliche Grammatik der Griechischen Sprache. Teil II, Bands I and II. Dritte Auflage von Bernhard Gerth. Hannover und Leipzig: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1898.
- Kümmel, Werner Georg. Promise and Fulfillment. Studies in Biblical Theology. No. 23. Translated by Dorothea M. Barton. London: SCM Press, 1957.
- Lampe, G. W. H. "The Holy Spirit in the Writings of St. Luke," Studies in the Gospels, Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot. Edited by D. E. Nineham. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955.
- Law, Robert. Tests of Life. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909.
- Leaney, A. R. C., Hanson, R. P. C., and Posen, J. Guide to the Scrolls: Nottingham Studies on the Qumran Studies. London: SCM Press, 1958.
- Lee, Kenneth Lee. The Religious Thought of St. John. London: S.P.C.K., 1950.
- van Leeuwen, C. Le Développement du Sens Social en Israël avant L'Ere Chrétienne, Studia Semitica Neerlandica. Edited by M. A. Beek, J. H. Hospees and Th. C. Vriezen. Assen: Van Gorcum and Comp. N. V., 1955.
- Lehmann, Paul L. "Foundations and Patterns of Christian Behavior," Christian Faith and Social Action. Edited by John A. Hutchison. New York: 1953, pp. 102ff.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Ethics in a Christian Context. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1963.
- Levi, Israel. The Hebrew Text of the Book of Ecclesiasticus. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1904.
- Levy, J. Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim und einen grossen Theil des rabbinischen Schriftthums. 2 vols. Leipzig: Verlag von Baumgärtners Buchhandlung, 1867-1868.
- Levy-Bruhl, Lucien. How Natives Think. Translated by L. A. Clare. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1926.
- Liddell, Henry George, and Scott, Robert. A Greek-English Lexicon. 2 vols. A new edition by Sir Henry Stuart Jones and Roderick McKenzie. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1925-40.

- The Loeb Classical Library. Edited by T. E. Page, E. Capps,  
and W. H. D. Rouse. London: William Heinemann, Ltd.,  
1912.
- Licht, Jacob. "An Analysis of the Treatise of the Two Spirits  
in DSD," Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Vol. IV of  
Scripta Hierosolymitana. Edited by Chaim Rabin and  
Xigael Yadin. Jerusalem: At the Magnes Press, The  
Hebrew University, 1958, pp. 88-100.
- Liebermann, Saul. "The Discipline in the so-called Dead Sea  
Discipline," Journal of Biblical Literature. Vol.  
LXXI (December 1952), 199-206.
- Lietzmann, Hans. An die Korinther I, II. Handbuch zum Neuen  
Testament. Vol. 9. Edited by Günther Bornkamm. 4th  
edition revised by Werner Georg Kümmel. Tübingen:  
Verlag J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1949.
- Lightfoot, J. B. Saint Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and  
to Philemon. London: Macmillan and Co., 1884.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Saint Paul's Epistle to the Philippians. London:  
Macmillan and Co., 1888.
- Lofthouse, W. F. "The Holy Spirit in the Acts and the Fourth  
Gospel," Expository Times. Vol. LII (1940-1941),  
334-336.
- Lohmeyer, Ernst. "ΣΥΝ ΧΡΙΣΤΩ," Festgabe für Adolf  
Deissmann, Zum 6/Geburtstag, 7 November 1926. Tübingen:  
Verlag Von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1927, pp. 218-257.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Die Brief an die Philipper, an die Kolosser und an  
Philemon, Kritisch - exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue  
Testament. 8th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht,  
1930.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Die Offenbarung des Johannes. Handbuch zum Neuen  
Testament. Vol. XVI. Edited by Günther Bornkamm.  
2nd revised edition. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul  
Siebeck), 1953.
- MacGregor, G. H. C., and Purdy, A. C. Jew and Greek: Tutors unto  
Christ. New edition. Edinburgh: The Saint Andrew Press,  
1959.
- Machen, J. Gresham. The Origin of Paul's Religion. New York:  
The Macmillan Company, 1928.

- Macmurray, John. Conditions of Freedom. London: Faber and Faber, Ltd., 1950.
- Maier, Johann. "Zum Begriff  $\tau\tau\tau$  in den Texten von Qumran," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft. Vol. LXXII, 2 (1960), 148-166.
- Manson, T. W. The Teaching of Jesus. 2nd ed. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1935.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Servant Messiah. Cambridge: University Press, 1953.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Ethics and the Gospel. London: SCM Press, 1960.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Fourth Gospel," Studies in the Gospels and Epistles. Edited by Matthew Black. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1962.
- Manson, William. The Gospel of Luke. The Moffatt New Testament Commentary. Edited by James Moffatt. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1930.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Jesus the Messiah. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1943.
- Marchant, G. J. C. "The Body of Christ," Evangelical Quarterly. Vol. XXX, No. 1 (January - March, 1958), 3-17.
- Marcus, Ralph. "Philo, Josephus and the Dead Sea Yahad," Journal of Biblical Literature. Vol. LXXI (1952), 207-209.
- Martin, Ralph P. The Epistle of Paul to the Philippians. The Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. Edited by R. V. G. Tasker. London: The Tyndale Press, 1959.
- Mayser, Edwin. Grammatik Der Griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit. Teil III, Band I. Zweite Ungearbeitete Auflage. Berlin and Leipzig: Walter De Gruyter and Co., 1936.
- Menoud, P. H. L'Evangile de Jean d'après les Recherches récentes. 2nd ed. Neuchâtel and Paris: Delachaux et Niestle, 1947.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Revelation and Tradition: The Influence of Paul's Conversion on His Theology," Interpretation: a Journal of Bible and Theology. Vol. VII (1953), 131-141.
- Milik, J. T. Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea. Translated by J. Strugnell. London: SCM Press, 1959.



- Moffatt, James. The New Testament in the Moffatt Translation.  
Revised edition. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1934.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians. Moffatt  
New Testament Commentaries. London: Hodder and  
Stoughton, 1938.
- Moller, P. Wernberg. The Manual of Discipline. Studies on the  
Texts of the Desert of Judah. Vol. I. Edited by J.  
Van der Ploeg. Leiden: E. F. Brill, 1957.
- Montefiore, Hugh. "Thou shalt love thy Neighbour as Thyself,"  
Novum Testamentum. Vol. V (July 1962), 157-170. y/
- Moore, George Foot. Judaism in the First Century of the Christian  
Era in the Age of the Tannaim. Vols. I-III. Cambridge:  
Harvard University Press, 1930.
- Morris, Leon. The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross. Grand  
Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1956.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, The  
Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. Edited by R.V.G.  
Tasker. London: The Tyndale Press, 1958.
- Moule, C.F.D. "The Judgement Theme in the Sacraments," The  
Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology.  
Edited by W. D. Davies and D. Daube in honour of C. H.  
Dodd. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1956, pp.  
464-481.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Sacrifice of Christ. London: Hodder and Stoughton,  
1956.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Christ's Messengers, Studies in the Acts of the  
Apostles Part 1, World Christian Books, No. 19. Edited  
by Stephen Neill. London: United Society for Christian  
Literature, Lutterworth Press, 1957.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Colossians and  
to Philemon. Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary.  
Cambridge: At the University Press, 1958.
- \_\_\_\_\_. An Idiom-Book of the New Testament Greek. Cambridge:  
At the University Press, 1959.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Once More, Who Were the Hellenists?" The Expository  
Times. Vol. LXX, 4 (January 1959), 100-102.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Individualism of the Fourth Gospel," Novum  
Testamentum. Vol. V (July 1962), 171-190.

- Moulton, James H. and Howard, W. F. A Grammar of New Testament Greek, Vol. II. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1929.
- Moulton, James H. and Milligan, George. "KOIVÓΣ " "KOIVOÚ "  
"KOIWRÉW " "KOIWYÍÁ " "KOIWRÍKOS "  
"KOIWNVÓS ," The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament.  
London: Hodder and Stoughton, Ltd., 1930.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament. London:  
Hodder and Stoughton, 1930.
- Mowinkel, Sigmund. He That Cometh. Translated by G. W. Anderson.  
Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1959.
- Munck, Johannes. Paul and the Salvation of Mankind. Translated  
by Frank, Clarke, London: SCM Press, 1959.
- Murray, John, The Epistle to the Romans. I. The New Inter-  
national Commentary on the New Testament. Edited by  
N. B. Stonehouse. Grand Rapids: Williams Be  
Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1959.
- Nauck, Wolfgang. Die Tradition und der Character des ersten  
Johann esbriefes, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum  
Neuen Testament. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr.(Paul  
Siebeck), 1957.
- Nestle, Eberhard. Novum Testamentum Graece. 23rd ed. Edited by  
Erwin Nestle and D. Kurt Aland. Stuttgart: Privilegierte  
Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1957.
- Neugebauer, Fritz. In Christus. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and  
Ruprecht, 1961.
- Neusner, Jacob. "The Fellowship ( ַן ַן ַן ַן ) In the Second  
Jewish Commonwealth," Harvard Theological Review.  
April 1960, pp. 125-142.
- The New English Bible. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961.
- Noack B. Zur johanneischen Tradition. Kopenhagen: Rosenkilde  
og Bagger, 1954.
- Nock, A. D. and Festugiere, A. J. Corpus Hermeticum. Paris:  
Societe D' Edition, "Les Belles Lettres," Vols. I-II  
(1945).
- North, C. R. The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah. Oxford:  
Oxford University Press, 1948.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Sacrifice," A Theological Word Book of the Bible.  
Edited by Alan Richardson. London: SCM Press, 1957.



- Nötscher, Frederick. "Heiligkeit in den Qumranschriften," Revue de Qumran. Vol. VI (February 1960), 163-182 and Vol. VII (June 1960), 315-344.
- Otto, Rudolph. The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man. Translated by F. V. Filson and B. L. Woolf. London: 1938.
- Pedersen, Johs. Israel, Its Life and Culture. London: Oxford University Press, Vols. I-II, III-IV (1926-1940).
- Percy, Ernst. Der Leib Christi (Σῶμα Χριστοῦ) in den paulinischen Homologumena und Antilegomena. Lunds Universitets Arsskrift. N.F. Avd. 1. Bd. 38. 38. N.1. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1942.
- Piper, Otto. "I John and the Didache of the Primitive Church," Journal of Biblical Literature. LXVI, 4 (December 1947), pp. 437-451.
- Plummer, Alfred. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1915.
- Pöhlmann, Robert von. Geschichte der sozialen Frage und der Sozialismus in der antiken Welt. 2 vols. 2nd ed. München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1912.
- Preiss, Theo. "Life in Christ and Social Ethics in the Epistle to Philemon," Life in Christ, Studies in Biblical Theology. No. 18. London: SCM Press, 1954, pp. 32-42.
- Preiss, . "Was the Last Supper a Paschal Meal?" Life in Christ, Studies in Biblical Theology. No. 13. London: SCM Press, 1954, pp. 82-99.
- Quell, Gottfried. "Σινοθήκη," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Vol. II. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1935, pp. 106-127.
- Quell, Gottfried and Stauffer, Ethelbert. Love, Bible Key Words from Gerhard Kittel's Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Translated by J. R. Coates. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1949.
- The Oxyrhynchus Papyri. Edited by B. J. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt. Oxford: Egypt Exploration Fund, Vol. I-XVII (1898-1927).
- Rabin, C. Qumran Studies, Scripta Judaica II. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1957.



- Rabin, C. The Zadokite Documents. 2nd ed. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1958.
- Rackham, Richard Belward. The Acts of the Apostles, Westminster Commentaries. Edited by Walter Lock. 9th ed. London: Methuen and Co., 1922.
- von Rad, Gerhard, Bertram, Georg, and Bultmann, Rudolf. "ῥάω, ῥωή, ἀράω, ῥωρ, ῥωορονέω, ῥωο- ποέω," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Vol. II. Edited by Gerhard Kittel, Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1935, pp. 144-150.
- Radermacher, Ludwig. Neutestamentliche Grammatik Das Griechisch Des Neuen Testaments im Zusammenhang mit der Volkssprache, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. Verlag von J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck) Tübingen: zweite, erweiterte auflage, 1925.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "σφραγίσθαι : Rm 15 28," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft. 1933, 87-89.
- Rawlinson, A. E. J. "Corpus Christ," Mysterium Christi. Edited by G. K. A. Bell and A. Deismann. London: Longman's, Gree and Co., 1930.
- Reicke, Bo. Diakonie, Festfreude und Zelos in Verbindung mit der altchristlichen Agapenfeier. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1951.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Glaube und Leben der Urgemeinde Bemerkungen zu Apg. 1-7. Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments. Zwingli-Verlag Zurich, 1957.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Risen Lord and His Church," Interpretation. April, 1959, pp. 157-169.
- Rengstorff, Karl Heinrich. "ῥιδαχή," Theologische Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Vol. II. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1935, pp. 166-167.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "ῥιδασκω," Theologische Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Vol. II. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1935, pp. 138-150.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "ῥώδεκα," Theologische Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Vol. II. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1935, pp. 321-328.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "μαρθάνω, καταμαρθάνω, μαθητής, συμμαθητής, μαθήτρια, μαθητεύω," Theologische Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Vol. IV. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1935, pp. 392-465.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Apostleship, Bible Key Words from Gerhard Kittel's Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Translated by J. R. Coates. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1952.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Das Evangelium nach Lukas, Das Neue Testament Deutsch. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1952.
- Rennie, W. Demosthenes, Orationes. Tomus III. Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis. Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1931.
- Richardson, Alan. An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament. London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1958.
- Riesenfeld, Harold. The Gospel Tradition and Its Beginnings, A Study in the Limits of Formgeschichte. London: Arranged by R. Mowbray and Co., 1957.
- Robertson and Alfred Plummer. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1911.
- Robinson, H. Wheeler. The Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit. London: Nisbet and Co., 1928.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Theology of the Old Testament," Record and Revelation. Edited by H. W. Robinson. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1932, pp. 303-348.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality," Werden und Wesen des Alten Testaments. Edited by J. Hempel. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1936.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1946.
- Robinson, J. A. T. The Body, Studies in Biblical Theology. No. 3. London: SCM Press, 1952.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Twelve New Testament Studies, Studies in Theology. No. 32. Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1962.

- Robinson, J. Armitage. "Communion," A Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by James Hastings. Vol. I. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1898, pp. 460-462.
- Robinson, James M. The Problem of History in Mark. London: SCM Press, 1957.
- \_\_\_\_\_. A New Quest of the Historical Jesus, Studies in Biblical Theology. No. 25. London: SCM Press, 1959.
- Ropes, James Hardy. The Synoptic Gospels. (Preface to 2nd Impression by D. E. Nineham.) London: Oxford University Press, 1934, 1960.
- Rowley, H. H. The Relevance of the Apocalyptic. Revised edition. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1946.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays. London: Lutterworth Press, 1952.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1952.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Faith of Israel. London: SCM Press, 1956.
- Ruckstuhl, E. Die literarische Einheit des Johannes-evangeliums, Studia Friburgensia. Neue Folge, Heft 3. Freiburg in der Schweiz, 1951.
- Schochter, S. Documents of Jewish Sectaries. Vol. I. Fragments of Zadokite Work. Cambridge: University Press, 1910.
- Schenkl, H. Epictet, Dissertationes Ab Arriano Digestae. Gnomologium Epicteteum Stobaei. Lipsiae: In Aedibus Bgt-Verbere, 1894.
- Schlatter, Adolf. Der Evangelist Mattäus. 3rd ed. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1948.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Paulus, Der Bote Jesu, Eine Deutung Seiner Briefe an die Korinther. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1956.
- Schlier, Heinrich. "Θαύρω, θαύρω," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Vol. III. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1938, pp. 139-148.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Der Brief an die Galater. (Meyer Series). 11th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1951.



- Schmidt, Karl Ludwig. The Church, Bible Key Words from Gerhard Kittel's Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Translated by J. R. Coates. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1950.
- Schmidt, Karl Ludwig, Kleinknecht, H., Kuhn, K. G., and Von Rad, Gerhard. Basilea, Bible Key Words from Gerhard Kittel's Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Translated by H. P. Kingdom. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1957.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolf. Die Johannesbriefe. Vol. XIII. Herders Theologisches Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. Edited by Alfred Wikenhauser and Anton Vogtle. 2nd ed. Freiburg: Herder, 1963.
- Schoeps, Hans-Joachim. (Erlangen) Urgemeinde Judenchristentum Gnosis. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1955.
- Schrenk, Gottlob. "ἐντέλλομαι, ἐντολή," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Vol. II. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1935, pp. 541-553.
- Schweitzer, Albert. The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle. Translated by William Montgomery. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1931.
- Schweizer, Eduard. Ego EIMI. Die religionsgeschichtliche Herkunft und theologische Bedeutung der johanneischen Bildreden, zugleich ein Beitrag zur Quellenfrage des vierten Evangeliums, Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, Neue Folge. 30. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1939.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Gegenwart des Geistes und eschatologische Hoffnung bei Zarathustra, spätjüdischen Gruppen, Gnostikern und den Zeugen des Neuen Testaments," The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology. Edited by W. D. Davies and D. Daube. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1956, p. 482ff.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Abendmahl: I. Im New Testament," Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Edited by Kurt Galling (3rd revised edition). Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1957, p. 10ff.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Gemeinde und Gemeindeordnung in Neuen Testament. Abhandlungen zur Theologisches Alten und Neuen Testament. 35. Zurich: Zwingli Verlag, 1959.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Concept of the Church in the Gospel and Epistles of St. John," New Testament Essays. Edited by A. J. B. Higgins. Manchester: The University Press, 1959, pp. 230-245.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Lordship and Discipleship. Studies in Biblical Theology. London: SCM Press, 1960.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Spirit of God, Bible Key Words from Gerhard Kittel's Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Translated by A. E. Harvey. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1960.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Church Order in the New Testament, Studies in Biblical Theology. No. 32. Translated by Frank Clarke. Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, 1961.
- Schweizer, Eduard, Sjöberg, Eric, Baumgärtel, Friedrich, and Kleinknecht, Hermann. "πνεῦμα, πνευματικός," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Vol. VI. Edited by Gerhard Friedrich. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1959, pp. 330-450.
- Scott, C. Anderson. "The Communion of the Body," The Expositor. 8th series. Vol. 18. Edited by W. R. Nicoll. 1919, 121-130.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "What Happened at Pentecost," The Spirit. Edited by B. H. Streeter. London: Macmillan and Company, 1919, pp. 117-157.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Fellowship of the Spirit. London: James Clarke and Co., Ltd., 1921.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The 'Fellowship,' a κοινωνία," The Expository Times. Vol. 35 (1923-24), 567.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Christianity According to St. Paul. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1927.
- Scott, E. F. The Pastoral Epistles. The Moffatt New Testament Commentary. London: Hodder and Staughton, 1936.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Epistle to the Phillipians. Vol. XI of The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by Nolan B. Harmon. New York: Abingdon, 1959.
- Scott, Walter. Hermetica I. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1924.
- Seesemann, Heinrich. Der Begriff κοινωνία im Neuen Testament, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft. 14. Giessen: Verlag von Alfred Töpelmann, 1933.



- Selby, Donald Joseph. Toward the Understanding of St. Paul. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1962.
- Selwyn, Edward Gordon. The First Epistle of St. Peter. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1947.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Eschatology in I Peter," The Background of the New Testament. Edited by W. D. Davies and D. Daube. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1956, pp. 394-401.
- Septuaginta. Edited by Alfred Rahlfs. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935.
- Sharp, Douglas. Epictetus and the New Testament. London: Charles Kelley, 1911.
- Shedd, Russell Philip. Man in Community: A Study of St. Paul's Application of the Old Testament and Early Jewish Conceptions of Human Solidarity. London: The Epworth Press, 1958.
- Simon, U. E. "Eternal Life in the Fourth Gospel," Studies in the Gospel. Edited by F. L. Cross. London: A. R. Mowbray and Co., 1957, pp. 97-109.
- Smith, W. R. The Religion of the Semites. Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black, 1859.
- Snaith, Norman. The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament. London: The Epworth Press, 1944.
- 99/ Staff, Frank. The Book of Acts, The Early Struggle for an Unhindered Gospel. Nashville: The Broadman Press, 1955.
- Stamm, Raymond T. The Epistle to the Galatians, The Interpreters Bible. Edited by Nolan B. Harman. New York: Abingdon Cokesbury, 1953.
- Stanley, David M. "The Theme of the Servant of Yahweh in Primitive Christian Soteriology, and its Transposition by Saint Paul," Catholic Biblical Quarterly. XVI (1954), pp. 385-425.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Liturgical Influences on the Formation of the Four Gospels," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly. XXI (January 1959), 24-38.
- Stauffer, Ethelbert. Jesus Gestalt und Geschichte. Bern: Francke Verlag, 1957.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Jesus and His Story. Translated by Richard and Clara Winston. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1960.



- Stewart, James. A Man in Christ. New York: Harper Brothers, n.d.
- Stibbs, Alan M. The First Epistle General of Peter. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. Edited by R. V. G. Tasker. London: The Tyndale Press, 1959.
- Stonehouse, N. B. The Witness of Matthew and Mark to Christ. London: The Tyndale Press, 1944.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Repentance, Baptism and the Gift of the Holy Spirit," Paul Before the Areopagus. London: The Tyndale Press, 1957.
- Strachan, R. H. The Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians. The Moffatt New Testament Commentary. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935.
- Strack, Hermann L. and Billerbeck, Paul. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch. 5 vols. München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Oskar Beck, 1922-28.
- Strathmann, Hermann. "μαρτυς, μαρτυρέω, μαρτυρία, μαρτύριον," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Vol. V. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1942, pp. 477-514.
- Stürmer, Karl. "Das Abendmahl bei Paulus," Evangelische Theologie. (July-August, 1947), 38-49.
- Sukenik, E. L. ʿOṣar hamnegillôth haggênûzôth. Jerusalem: The Hebrew University, 1954.
- Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum. Vols. 3-4. Edited by L. Robert. Lugduni Batavorum: Aphud A. W. Sijthoff, 1929.
- Sutcliffe, Edmund F. The Monks of Qumran. London: Burris and Gates, Publishers to the Holy See, 1960.
- Swete, Henry Barclay. The Holy Spirit in the New Testament. London: Macmillan and Co., 1909-1919.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Apocalypse of St. John. 3rd ed. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1909-1951.
- Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum. 2 vols., and index. 2nd ed. E. W. Dittenberger. Leipzig: Apud S. Hirzelium, 1888-1901; 3rd ed., 1915-24.
- Taylor, Vincent. Jesus and His Sacrifice. London: Macmillan and Co., 1937.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Forgiveness and Reconciliation. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1956; 1st ed., 1941.

- \_\_\_\_\_. The Gospel According to St. Mark. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1952.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Life and Ministry of Jesus. London: Macmillan and Co., 1954.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Atonement in New Testament Teaching. 3rd ed. London: The Epworth Press, 1958.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Person of Christ in New Testament Teaching. London: Macmillan and Co., 1959.
- Teeple, Howard M. "Qumran and the Origin of the Fourth Gospel," Novum Testamentum. IV (October 1960), 6-25.
- Thayer, Joseph Henry. A Greek English Lexicon of the New Testament. 4th ed. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1901.
- Thornton, L. S. The Common Life in the Body of Christ. 3rd ed. London: Dacre Press, 1950.
- Van Unnik, W. C. "The Purpose of St. John's Gospel," Studia Evangelica. Edited by Kurt Aland, F. L. Cross, Jean Danielou, Harold Riesenfeld and W. C. van Unnik. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altkirchlichen Literatur. Edited by Kurt Aland, Walther Eltester und Erich Klostermann. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1959, pp. 382-411.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The 'Book of Acts' - The Confirmation of the Gospel," Novum Testamentum. IV (October 1960), 26-59.
- Vermes, Geza. "The Etymology of 'Essenes'," Revue de Qumran. (June 1960), 427-443.
- Vincent, Marvin R. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Philippians and to Philemon: The International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1897.
- Volz, P. Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im Neutestamentlichen Zeitalter nach den Quellen der rabbinischen, apokalyptischen und apokryphen Literatur. 2 Auflage. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1934.
- Vriezen, T. C. An Outline of Old Testament Theology. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958.
- Weiss, Bernhard. Die Drei Briefe des Apostel Johannes, I. II. III. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. 6th revised edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1899.

- Weiss, Johannes. Der Erste Korintherbrief. Kritisch-exegetische Kommentar über das Neue Testament. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1925.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The History of Primitive Christianity. Vol. I. Translated by Rudolf Knopf and edited by F. C. Grant. New York: Wilson-Erickson, 1937.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Earliest Christianity. Vol. I. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1959.
- Wendt, Hans Heinrich. Die Apostelgeschichte, Kritisch - exegetische Kommentar über das Neue Testament. Edited by H. A. W. Meyer. 9th revised edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1913.
- Wendland, Heinz-Dietrich. "Das Wirken des Heiligen Geistes in den Gläubigen nach Paulus," Theologische Literaturzeitung. 77 (1952), 457-470.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Die Brief an die Korinther, Das Neue Testament Deutsch. Neubearbeitete auflage. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1954.
- Westcott, Brook Foss. The Epistles of St. John. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1905.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Epistle to the Hebrews. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1906.
- Wikenhauser, Alfred. Pauline Mysticism. Translated by Joseph Curningham. Edinburgh: Nelson, 1960.
- Wilder, Amos N. Eschatology and Ethics in the Teaching of Jesus. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1938, 1950.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "I, II and III John," Interpreter's Bible. Vol. XII. Edited by Nolan B. Harmon. New York: Abingdon Press, 1957.
- Williams, G. S. C. The Acts of the Apostles. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.
- Wilson, W. G. "An examination of the linguistic evidence adduced against the unity of authority of the First Epistle of John and the Fourth Gospel," Journal of Theological Studies. XLVIII (1948), 147-156.
- Windisch, H. Der Zweite Korinther Brief. Kritisch-exegetische Kommentar über das Neue Testament. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1924.



- \_\_\_\_\_. Der Hebraerbrief. Vol. XIV of Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. Edited by Hans Lietzmann. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1931.
- Wool, H. G. "The Conversion of St. Paul: Its Nature, Antecedents and Consequences," New Testament Studies. I (1955), 276-282.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Didache, Kerygma and Evangelion," New Testament Essays. Edited by A. J. B. Higgins. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959, pp. 306-314.
- Wood, William Spear. "Fellowship," The Expositor Times. Vol. XXI. (1921), 33-40.
- Van der Woude, A. S. Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumran. New York: Van Nostrand and Co., 1957.
- Wright, G. E. The Biblical Doctrine of Man in Society. London: SCM Press, 1954.